

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CCXXVII.]

NOVEMBER, 1863.

[VOL. XIX.]

BIBLICAL GLEANINGS.

I.

ISAIAH xviii. xix.

M. MARIETTE, whose researches in Egypt, carried on under the direction of the late Viceroy, have brought many curious monuments to light—among the rest the splendid objects from the tomb of an Egyptian queen which attracted so much notice in the Exhibition of last year—has discovered, at Gebel-el-Birkel, a hieroglyphical inscription which may perhaps throw some light on the above passage. The Viscount de Rougé, who is at the head of the department of Egyptian antiquities in the Louvre, has given a detailed account of it in the last No. of the *Revue Archéologique*.

Gebel-el-Birkel, the ancient Napata, was the seat of that Ethiopian monarchy which, in the eighth century before Christ, disputed with Egypt the possession of the valley of the Nile. It was in a debateable land, for we find in it not only the monument of Tirhakah the Ethiopian, but of several Egyptian kings, and in the vicissitudes of dominion, sometimes the sovereigns of Thebes pushed their conquests to Napata, sometimes the sovereigns of Napata made themselves masters of Thebes, Memphis and Lower Egypt. The recently discovered monument contains an account of one of the successful invasions of Egypt by a sovereign, whose capital was Napata, but who appears to have been himself of Egyptian origin. His name has been read by Mariette and the Viscount de Rougé, Pianchi-Meriamoun. The monument is a *stele* of granite, covered on its sides and apex with hieroglyphics. Immediately after the enunciation of his royal titles, which are the usual ones of Egyptian kings, follows a recital of an expedition commanded by him in person from Ethiopia as far as Memphis and even into the Delta. In the course of this campaign he claims to have reduced into submission various kings and princes who divided among themselves the sovereignty of Egypt. Conspicuous among these is one named Tafnecht, who appears to have brought already many of the chiefs into obedience, and threatened to make himself sole master of Egypt. Pianchi puts his army in motion, and various places are mentioned of which they successively make themselves masters, as they march down the valley of the Nile. The Egyp-

tian designations of many of these places, with their corresponding Greek names, have been ascertained by Brugsch; others remain to be identified. They enter Thebes, and between Thebes and Memphis, at a place not yet ascertained, they encounter the fleet and army of Tafnecht and put them to flight, but themselves receive a check before the town of Hermopolis Magna. The king, rallying his forces, is on the point of storming the town, when it surrenders and pays a ransom. A king called Nimrod commanded here; he comes in an attitude of homage to Pianchi, and engages to pay him an annual tribute. Another king, named Pefacbast, comes also to make submission; and thus at last Memphis is reached. Tafnecht, the prince of Sais, enters the place with a reinforcement of 8000 men, but it is taken by assault, and the neighbouring nomes submit themselves to Pianchi. Two kings, Osorkon of Bubastis and Uaput come to do him homage. Last of all Tafnecht makes his submission.

Nothing indicates that Pianchi was the king of a foreign nation, who came into Egypt as a conqueror. His name is Egyptian; he worships the Egyptian gods; he has already an army in Thebes, as we may infer from the absence of all fighting to obtain possession of it. He is evidently of Egyptian stock, though we know not how it has happened that he had established himself at Napata; and he appears to have been invited into Egypt by the Egyptians, in order that an end might be put to the anarchy and usurpation which prevailed. Now in the passage of Isaiah referred to above, just such a period is described. "I will set the Egyptians against the Egyptians, and they shall fight every one against his brother, and every one against his neighbour; city against city and kingdom against kingdom. And the Egyptians I will give over into the hand of a cruel lord; and a fierce king shall rule over them." No one who is familiar with the style of Jewish prophecy would look in history for a literal fulfilment of such predictions as that "the waters shall fail from the sea, and the river be wasted and dried up" (ver. 5). Physical calamity is supposed here, as elsewhere, to be the accompaniment of political confusion and national distress. But the description of the state of anarchy and civil war is too precise to be set down as a vague anticipation or a hostile threat. Yet history has not recorded for us any such condition of Egypt, within the limits of time to which Isaiah's prophecy could be referred with probability. The Dodecarchia, or joint government of the twelve chiefs, which was ended by the usurpation of Psammitichus, naturally suggests itself: but to this there are two obvious objections. First, no such state of civil dissension as Isaiah describes preceded the assumption of sovereignty by Psammitichus. On the contrary, the dodecarchs are said to have lived amicably together, and to have joined in

building the Labyrinth.* Secondly, the prophesying of Isaiah included from the reign of Uzziah to that of Hezekiah; and though the year of his death, or the cessation of his prophesying, is not known, his life can hardly have been extended beyond the year 700 B.C., even supposing him to have *begun* to prophesy in the year in which Uzziah died. But the sole monarchy of Psammitichus cannot be placed earlier than 665 B.C. This date may be considered as fixed by the discoveries of the Apis tablets made by Mariette in the Serapeum of Memphis. But it is not the custom of the Hebrew prophets to go far into futurity when they speak of political events, and hence also a strong presumption arises against the supposition that Psammitichus is meant.† Neither was he “a cruel lord and a fierce king.”

Two suggestions have been offered in solution of the difficulty. The date of the sole reign of Psammitichus has been raised by Gesenius as high as 711 B.C., which, for the reason given above, is inadmissible. Others have denied that Isaiah is the author of the oracle, and referred it to a nameless prophet living near the time of Psammitichus, against which supposition it may fairly be urged that its style is that of Isaiah's genuine oracles. The discovery of the distracted state of Egypt at the time of Pianchi's invasion allows us to suppose that the prophecy refers to him, and that it proceeded from Isaiah. M. de Rougé has entered into calculations which make it probable that Pianchi lived between 770 and 725 B.C., which accords very well with the time of Isaiah. Enough is recorded on the monument of Pianchi to justify the appellation of a fierce king; and the allusion to Zoan, or Lower Egypt (xix. 11), as the seat of the monarchy, accords well with the fact, which the monument discloses, that it was the ambition of Tafnecht, the prince of Sais, which had produced the distracted state of the kingdom. The prophet seems to have considered Egypt as sunk into such weakness by these dissensions, that Judah had become a terror to it (xix. 17). He even anticipates that it should be colonized by Jews, the worship of Jehovah being established there, and that Judæa, Assyria and Egypt should form a triple union, under the special protection of Jehovah. We know of no historical events corresponding to these anticipations; but from the mention of the invasion of Egypt by the army of Sargon in chap. xx., it should seem as if some great humiliation both of Egypt and Ethiopia by the Assyrians was looked for. Knobel supposes that Sargon was the fierce king who was to be set over Egypt. Sargon, according to the interpreters of the cuneiform inscriptions, came

* Herod. ii. 147. Diodorus, i. 66, speaks of a period of anarchy as preceding the Dodecarchia, but this would not bring us up to the age of Isaiah.

† Sir Gardner Wilkinson (Rawlinson's Herodotus, ii. 250) refers the prophecy to the state of Egypt under Apries (Hophra), which, as Apries was the great-grandson of Psammitichus, is still more improbable.

to the throne in 721 B.C.; but though he took Azotus, it does not appear that he conquered Egypt.

It must suffice for the present to point out the connection which the *stele* of Gebel-el-Birkel may have with this passage in Isaiah. Whether this connection be real or not, it certainly makes an important addition to the internal history of Egypt.

II.

ISAIAH iii. 16—23.

Among the marks of corruption of manners which excited the censorial indignation of the prophet, was the luxury of female ornament and attire. He enumerates with a particularity shewing the earnestness with which, as a patriot and a prophet, he regarded the evil, "the neck-crescents, the ear-pendants, and the bracelets and the veils, the tiaras and the ankle-chains and the belts and the scent-boxes and the amulets, the rings and the nose-jewels,"* as well as the costly robes in which they enfolded themselves. The ornaments of the Egyptian, Grecian, Etruscan ladies have come to light from the sepulchres in which they had been deposited, apparently on the same principle on which the warrior was buried with his arms—that the dead might be surrounded with the objects in which they had most delighted during life. But no such treasures have been found to illustrate a Jewish lady's toilette, either because their tombs have been long ago rifled, or because the Jews had made the discovery that gold might be put to more profitable uses than by burying it with its owner. Hopes were entertained that the recent exploration of the sites of the old Phœnician cities might have furnished specimens of Phœnician jewellery and goldsmith's work, which, as they no doubt supplied the Jews, no less than the Greeks, with the works of the fine arts, might have served for the illustration of the passage in Isaiah. These hopes have not been fulfilled; the specimens of Phœnician art which M. Renan has brought back, belong to a late age. But what was not found where it was looked for, has turned up where no one had expected it. The island of Rhodes, like that of Cyprus, was early visited by the Phœnicians, and from before the time of the Trojan War it had three considerable towns, Lindus, Ialysus and Camirus, which sunk into insignificance after the foundation of Rhodes. The site of Camirus has recently been explored, and remains have been discovered there in pottery and jewellery, the style of which is archaic, and decidedly not Greek, Egyptian nor Assyrian, but yet Asiatic, and therefore is supposed with much probability to be Phœnician. For as early as the time of Homer, they supplied the Mediterranean islands with trinkets.† Two specimens of their goldsmith's work, found

* See Revised Translation.

† Od. *δ.* 415.

at Camirus, have recently been added to the collections of the Louvre, and are figured in the *Revue Archéologique* for July. In the delicacy of the workmanship they equal the finest specimens from the tombs of Etruria. One quality in the work is particularly remarkable. The visitors to the Exhibition of last year will probably remember the beautiful imitations of Etruscan work by Signor Castellani. In his interesting account of the difficulties which he had to overcome, he tells us that he was long unable to discover the method by which the ancient artist had contrived to cover the face of his work with the minutest grains of gold, and that he only succeeded, by finding in the recesses of the mountains workmen who had followed immemorially a traditional process. The ornaments found at Camirus exhibit this kind of work in perfection. They are of the purest gold and of graceful form, with the exception of the figures—a lion in one case, a female in the other (apparently the Phœnician Venus)—characterized by the stiffness and exaggeration which the imitation of the figure exhibits in the history of art, long after the imitation of plants and flowers has attained to elegance and truth. The filigree chains have, pendant at the sides and ends, representations of the flower and fruit of the pomegranate, hung on smaller chains. In one of the ornaments there are twelve of these, in the other eight. Swinging against each other, or against the chains from which they depend, these golden bells, as the wearer moved, must have given out that tinkling sound in which, according to the prophet, the Jewish women so much delighted, that they affixed bells to their anklerings. The ornaments which I have described were evidently personal, and designed to be fastened on the dress. The discoverer, M. Salzmann, assigns them to the eighth century B.C., the period to which the passage in Isaiah belongs.

K.

SCEPTICISM UNSATISFACTORY TO A GIFTED MIND.

THE illustrious Niebuhr unfortunately was led to doubt, if not absolutely to reject, Christianity. But he found no satisfaction in his non-belief. His most recent biographer (Mr. Merivale) says, "It was on the birth of his son that the sense of his indeterminateness of his own creed—of the chasm between his feelings and his opinions—became suddenly intolerable to him; and he determined, and with his curious simplicity of character bluntly declared his determination, that the child 'should believe in the letter of the Old and New Testaments.'" "I shall nurture in him," he adds, "from his infancy a firm faith in all *I have lost or feel uncertain about.*" How expressive the testimony this incident bears to the need of revelation, and the suitableness, as a whole, of the revelation which the Bible contains to a cultivated mind!

THE RISE OF THE OLD DISSENT IN THE PEAK OF DERBYSHIRE.

INTENDED AS A SPECIMEN OF A NEW NONCONFORMISTS' MEMORIAL. 1851.

BY REV. JOSEPH HUNTER.

ADDITIONAL MSS., BRITISH MUSEUM, 24,621.

THE DEANERY OF THE HIGH PEAK.*

AFTER him came Samuel Ogden, with whom Mr. Bagshaw says that he had sweet intimacy and, if it were not his own fault, edifying communion.

"He was of the Ogdens near Oldham. There were divers of them of note for parts, and I hope for piety, according to their principles. The first time God favoured me with his society was at a lecture at *Saddleworth*, where his converse convinced me that he was of another and choicer spirit than many in the ministry are. I, though unworthy of such a favour and honour, have preached as for, so with him. Some A.B. of Glasgow have noted that, though highly prevailing, melancholy tendeth to obscure and obstruct the workings of grace; few that are eminently gracious are without some touches of it. At times this dear brother was more than touched herewith. What I next write was read by the best observers of him. 1. He was (as was Moses) learned, and there are those who shine in the firmament of Church and State whose profiting under him thoroughly proves it. 2. How solid, substantial and practical his preaching was, there are yet many witnesses; and that it was searching, a person of quality found and felt, though he quarreled with it. 3. His conversation was such as became and adorned the gospel. He was a burning as well as shining light. 4. The tenderness of his conscience appeared in that, tho' he was far from the separation which is justly called rigid, yet when he could not in full conformity serve the Church, he for many years suffered no small loss on that account. Such was the inoffensiveness wherewith he demeaned himself in his suffering state, that persons dignified in the Church made way for his being made master of a public school, for which he was singularly fitted, and in which he was signally owned. 6. Though the Lord denied to continue to him the son which he desired me to baptize, his daughters did imitate their precious mother, who, being the daughter of a good old Nonconformist, when in a single state shone as a star of the first magnitude among matrons near Ouldham (Oldham). 7. I will add this: tho' his brothers differed from him as to ecclesiasticals, yet none of them was more blessed as to temporals."

I have seen this memorandum in his own handwriting: "I began to officiate at Buxton, 18 July, 1652." He had studied at Christ College, Cambridge, where Mr. Ball was his tutor; most of whose pupils seem to have left the University with a strong leaning against the Church and its ordinances. He married, and it appears from Calamy's account of him that his father-in-law was the incumbent of Oldham. Soon after his marriage he

* Continued from p. 614.

settled at Buxton. Great expectations appear to have been formed of him, for on the 17th of September following, the Committee for Plundered Ministers voted that the augmentation out of the estate of Rowland Eyre, Papist and delinquent, and the Earl of Newcastle, should be continued to him.

Mr. Ogden received Presbyterian ordination at the hands of the classis at Wirksworth, no Presbyterian classis having been formed in the hundred of the High Peak. This document, dated September 26, 1653, as well as the order for the continuance to him of the augmentation, may be read in Calamy. And there also may be seen a copy of a document relating to the next event in the life of Mr. Ogden—his presentation to the chapel at Fairfield, which, though in the parish of Hope, is yet close to Buxton, and the two chapels were usually in those times held by the same person. He was presented by the Earl of Rutland, the regular patron, who was then living retired, having taken no very decided part in the contest which had been going on. But this presentation was in those days not sufficient, and Mr. Ogden went before the Commissioners for the Approbation of Public Preachers, whose sanction he obtained, dated October 23, 1654. Mr. Ogden continued here till 1657, when he removed to Mackworth, near Derby, where he continued his public ministry till 1662, when he took his post with the Nonconforming ministers. While at Buxton and Mackworth he was much employed in tuition, for which he appears to have been admirably qualified. When he was ejected from the Church, he still continued to reside at Mackworth, instructing youth there; but after a time he opened a school at Derby, which he continued for many years. At length the master of the free grammar-school of that town complained that Mr. Ogden's school drew away youth who ought to attend the grammar-school. Mr. Ogden tried the right in 1685, and lost the cause. But the friends of Mr. Ogden, who knew his value, obtained for him the mastership of the grammar-school at Wirksworth. Sir John Gell was in this the chief instrument. He removed to Wirksworth in 1686, and there he remained till his death on the 23rd of May, 1697. Mr. Ogden appears in one respect to have been unlike most of his brethren of the ejection. He was not the constant and assiduous preacher that Mr. Bagshaw, Mr. Heywood and many others were. Dr. Calamy says that he preached to the people about Wirksworth, and he gives us in his Continuation a copy of the licence which was given him in the Indulgence of 1672, to be a teacher in a room or rooms in the house of Thomas Saunders, of Little Ireton, in Derbyshire. Mr. Ogden cannot but be regarded as one of the chief ornaments of the Nonconformist body, and as a man of whom any church or community might think itself honoured by having such a person connected with it. Dr. Calamy enters into his character and attainments with some particularity, and what he

says of him must now be presented to the reader. It is one of the best articles in Dr. Calamy's book.

"He was a very ingenious man, and a polite and excellent scholar. He had a genius that led him to all the parts of refined literature. He valu'd no notions that were mean or trivial, but was ever taken up with the more curious and manly parts of learning. An eminent conformist in a letter to him, express'd himself thus: *I dare commit anything to your free and generous understanding.* He was a good linguist, he wrote pure Latin. He would take Eusebius or any other such Greek author, and read it currently in English at first sight. When the pretended Archbishop of Samos travel'd through England, he visited Mr. Ogden, who entertain'd him in the Greek tongue. He was also well vers'd in the Hebrew language. His last work at night was the reading an Hebrew chapter, which was become very familiar to him, through the great pains he had taken in that tongue; of which some manuscripts which he hath left behind him are a specimen. He had very good natural parts. His behaviour was obliging, and his conversation not morose and supercilious, but affable, graceful, and pleasant. He was eminent in divinity. He had studied the most difficult points; and would discourse on the hardest controversies with that readiness and clearness, as shew'd he had labour'd in them. He hath left behind him a treatise about the *Decrees*, and another concerning the *separate Existence of the Soul between Death and the Resurrection.* This was drawn up at the request of a young gentleman in the university, who had been his scholar, and was tainted with infidelity. His treatise about *Predestination* was occasion'd by his own melancholy, which forc'd him to a deep search into those points, in order to the clearing up to himself the goodness and mercy of God, and the representing him as amiable in all his ways, and righteous in his judgments. He has said however, that he would not advise others to embroil themselves, as he had done in those controversies: But added, that he was compell'd to do it by the temptations he lay under. His judgment was much the same with Mr. Corbets upon those matters.

"By his own tryals and studies, he became very skilful in administering comfort to troubled minds. As he receiv'd some letters from Mr. Angier, Mr. Prime and others, drawn up with great respect and tenderness to him in his sorrows, so did he often write himself to persons in affliction, to direct and comfort them with great wisdom and compassion.

"He was a good mathematician, and took delight in algebra, trigonometry, and the several parts of the mathematicks. He was acquainted with some of the greatest men of the age in that science, and taught his scholars that were studious and ingenious the elements of the mathematicks, on purpose to charm them into a love of those studies, that they might there find manly pleasure, and not be drawn to debauchery under a pretence of pleasure. And he was us'd to observe that very few good mathematicians were lewd and scandalous. He was a great lover of musick, both vocal and instrumental. He was also well vers'd in natural philosophy, and very ready in the Cartesian scheme. He could readily tell you what had been said by the several parties among philosophers to solve the several phenomena about fire, gravity, &c. He would frequently write down several difficult and curious questions, both to recreate himself, and exercise others upon occasion.

“He took great delight in poetry, and especially in Latin verse; and did so even to his old age. Often would he divert himself with making a copy of verses, upon any subject that offer’d; but most commonly his subjects were serious. He had a considerable insight into anatomy, and several parts of physick; but especially botanism. Herein he exceeded many physicians. ’Twas a rare thing to him to meet with an herb that he could not readily name in Latin and English: And as to most, he would tell you the nature and effects.

“He was wise and judicious, and able to give good advice. He would reason sedately upon any things that offer’d. He was very distant from extreams, and was not violent for or against any party. He wrote a political book in 83 or 84 that was very suitable to the complexion of those times.

“His Nonconformity was the fruit of close and deliberate thoughts. Some reckon’d that he had too high notions of the power of the magistrate in matters of religion. He was for communicating with the Establish’d Church occasionally, but never could come into it as a fix’d member. His thoughts about that matter will sufficiently appear, by a letter of his to an ingenious and learned clergy-man, which I shall here subjoin.

““Sir,—Our mutual acquaintance and endearment, shall excuse all prefatory words as superfluous between you and me. As I set my face towards the Church of England, I am confronted with objections of various kinds, which you perhaps may be better able to dissipate than I, standing upon higher ground, and seeing your strength in more advantageous light. One or two at present give me leave to bring into view, in the same equipage in which they came into my thoughts. Indeed they are not accurate and scholastick, but seem so much the more stanch and robust.

““1. To conform is to leave the society of the best and most religious people in the land; to desert the peculiar work and sufferings of the most painful and successful ministers. For is not the presence of God and his blessing, more abundantly in our select assemblies, than in the publick parochial congregations? By whom have the most part of the godly and sincere Christians been rais’d, and built up, but by the prayers, pains, doctrine, and conduct of the Nonconformists? Shall I leave the snow of Lebanon for Kedar and Meshech? Can I be secure of God’s grace and blessing, if I depart, from the confines of Hermon, where God has made his blessings to fall? Dod, Hildersham, Ball, Angier, &c. in a word the best men are with us: Ergo.

““2. To conform, what is it else for matter and substance, but to adjoin my self to the dissolute multitude; to a clergy more ambitious of preferment than to be examples of meekness and sobriety to their flocks? To act in, or to be an abettor to the briberies and corruptions of spiritual courts? Or where shall zeal for real godliness, find either encouragement or preferment, unless it be upon the merits of a redundant conformity? Or what criminal if he have either money or friendship may not elude the thunder of their censures? May I be secure of my former innocency, and not be made worse by such society? Pardon the odium of these expressions, and set these two parties together, in the air one of another, then tell me, whether you may not say as Tully in

another case, *Ex hac parte Púdor, illá impudentia: Ex hac parte Pietas, ex illá Avaritia?* &c.

“3. To conform is not only to assert by practice, but to assent to in express terms, all the dubious articles of faith, all the imperfect forms of prayer, all the erroneous translations of Scripture, all the unaccountable rubricks, and prescriptions of the Common-Prayer-Book, together with the questionable ceremonies us'd, all which have been the scruples, scandals and stumbling-stone of most good men in England for many scores of years. Do I approve of all these, or may I not by my compliance, hinder as much as in me lies, their future reformation? Tell me, good friend, may I innocently after a reformation upon the wheel, thus by *assent* and *consent* sufflamine the work thereof? These things I have transferr'd to my self by a figure, but notwithstanding am still

“‘Sir yours, &c.’

“Another thing that he laid great stress upon, was *re-ordination*, which he utterly dislik'd. He was of opinion, that the Church of England would one time or other, come under some sore judgment for their stiff adhering to their impositions, and refusing to make any amendments, tho' earnestly petition'd and solicited thereunto. He also thought that the overmuch doting upon the Common-Prayer, was one great occasion of the debauchery and wickedness of the age. Many people contented themselves with being loud and zealous, at the prayers, and that's all their religion: and so they intend says he *μυκτηρίζεσθαι* as the expression is Gal. vi. 7, that is lead God by the nose, and go to heaven in their sins, whether he will or no. He thought the *idolizing* the Common-Prayer, and placing all religion in it, was a provocation to the good spirit of God, so that it became ineffectual almost to edification: For (said he) whatever is highly esteem'd among men, is an abomination in the sight of God.

“He was one of great diligence, and lost no time. He taught school between forty and fifty years: for some time he taught a public free school; but when he was minister of Buxton or Mackworth, he was full of boarders in his own house. He bred many eminent scholars. And all the time of his publick or more private ministring he wrote his sermons *verbatim*, which took up a great deal of time; and yet in the midst of such employment, he became, and did all that has been related.

“But there was in him a richer accomplishment than any has been mention'd yet; and that was his eminent holiness. He walked with God, and was frequent, tho' ever short in prayer. He was a man of great wisdom, tenderness of conscience, and real piety. He was a peaceable, humble, charitable man. He took frequent occasions to instill good thoughts into them that were with him.”—II. 192—196.

Mr. Bagshaw seems to have taken no notice of a minister whose residence here seems to have intervened between Constantine and Ogden. This was John Jackson, whom we have before met at Baslow. He is returned as minister here in June, 1650, with the character of “reputed honest” by the Parliamentary Committee, as per return (?) at Lambeth. Calamy says that he was ejected here, but gives no account of him. He is doubtless the Mr. Jackson who is thus spoken of by Sir John

Floyer, the Litchfield physician, Discourse of the Bathes in England, 12mo, 1697: "Mr. Jackson, a minister of the gospel, having left a place of considerable value, came and served in this mean place of Buxton, in expectation of the benefit of this bathe, and received a perfect cure of the stone by the same."

And here seems to be the proper place to dispose of Fairfield. This place the Parliamentary Commissioners of 1650 report to be fit to be made a parish, which has remained as a chapelry of Hope parish ever since Thomas Nicholson was the minister in 1650, reputed an honest man. After him came Mr. Ogden; and after him William Naden, who was ejected here. He is not named by Bagshaw, and all that Dr. Calamy says of him is that he had a wife and five children when turned out of Fairfield.

A Presbyterian chapel arose in Buxton. The earliest minister of whom I have any account is a Mr. Holland, one of several early Dissenting ministers of the name living in these parts. He was here in 1716. After Mr. Holland were Richard Scholefield, a member of the ancient family of Scholefield, in the parish of Rochdale, and father of Radcliffe Scholefield, minister for many years of one of the chapels in Birmingham; William Harrison (the great-grandfather of William Harrison Ainsworth), who, leaving Buxton, succeeded Dr. Clegg at Chinley in 1756; and George Buxton, who died minister here towards the close of the century. The congregation had declined, and depended more upon the visitors to the baths than on the resident population, so that of late years the trustees of the chapel, who have some ancient funds at their disposal, have been content with keeping the chapel open only during the Buxton season, when it is supported by many of the neighbouring ministers in town.

Of Hope, neither Mr. Bagshaw nor Dr. Calamy has anything to say. We have seen something of the kind of man who was vicar here at the beginning of the century. In 1650, Thomas Bocking was the vicar, a Royalist, who had borne arms against the Parliament, and by the Puritan Commissioners was then reported scandalous.

In the neighbouring church of Castleton, Samuel Cryer was the minister at the time when Mr. Bagshaw wrote on the spiritual things of the Peak. He had then been more than forty years the vicar, but is "now most a father of any minister in the Peak." He was the son of an elder Cryer, one of Mr. Bagshaw's predecessors in the living of Glossop. Mr. Bagshaw seems to have had a great esteem for Mr. Cryer, of Castleton: "May they who have heard his elaborate and eloquent discourses evidence that they have heard God speaking through and by him." But he forbears to expatiate, on his principle of saying little of persons then alive. Mr. Cryer was here as early as 1650, and was a conformist in 1662.

"It was a privilege to Mr. Cryer, the son, who is now most a father

of any minister in the High Peak, that he was (though not immediately) the successor of the thrice worthy Mr. Isaac Ambrose, a star of the first magnitude, for a time fixed at Castleton, by the highest hand and under it, by the then Bishop of Chester, who (I suppose) was Dr. Bridgman, father of that oracle of the law, Sir Orlando Bridgman. I had not the happiness to converse with (or indeed to see) this saint of the Lord, save once at Manchester. At that time his love to Castleton (upon the mention of it) revived; tears shot into his eyes, and from his mouth fell this ingenuous acknowledgment: It was my sin, and is my sorrow, that I left that place when the Lord was blessing my ministry in it. May this be a fair warning to others, that they be not hasty in removing from their people! There were (among others) two persons of whom he kept an endearing remembrance, who sometimes were so kind as to visit him, to whom some of his precious works were sent by him,—precious I may well call his works, which in a large edition praise him, and give many cause to praise God for him. May they and other fruits of his ministry long and long abide on the hearts of those that at Preston and Garstang did most enjoy him! Some others, besides famous Mr. Brightman and acute Dr. Spurstow, have judged that there was a desirableness in a speedy, though not an every way sudden death, who had what they desired. As to others, so to this saint Ambrose, death was as a clock that gives but a little warning before it strikes. In a short space, comparatively, he was considerably well and thoroughly dead.”

Mr. Ambrose was a Nonconformist in 1662, retiring from the vicarage of Garstang, in Lancashire, to which county the full account of him belongs. It is remarkable that Dr. Calamy does not appear to have known that he was ever vicar of Castleton, which is another evidence that he was little acquainted with the biographical tract of Mr. Bagshaw. But Mr. Bagshaw is mistaken in supposing that it was the Bishop of Chester who placed him here. It was Morton, Bishop of Litchfield and Coventry, who presented him, on a lapse, March 17, 1627. He succeeded Ralph Cantrell, who was buried at Hope in October, 1626. Lawrence Castle was the name of Mr. Ambrose's successor.

“Having been brief in my notes at Castleton, I am desirous to step over the hill into Edale, a chapelry belonging thereto. I have not only heard of, but in my childhood heard, worthy Mr. Cresswell, one who drew as his first so his last breath in our parts. He was sometimes chaplain at Lime Hall, and preacher at Disley, not far from it. . . . It is credibly reported that having preached on these words, *The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God*, one counted a natural did, after sermon, follow the coach wherein he was, and charged him (at least) with a mistake, saying, *I do believe there is a God*. I well remember that at Tideswell his text was, *There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked*. Of that and other sermons which he preached there, I, when young, have heard elder persons speak much. Similitudes and histories of which he made use and application were very affecting. The Lord was pleased to house him when the great storm of war fell on England. He called this his servant from his work, when that black night was come or coming. Surely Edale was a dale or valley of vision in his days!

May their posterity shew their profiting by others, as many did that were profited by him!

“One who succeeded him was Mr. Robert Wright, who, tho’ less furnished than many with a desirable library, and falling short of not a few as to outward estate, was diligent in service and patient in suffering for God. Far is it from me to say that he was a voice and nothing more. May not the plainness of some preachers be, in some places and to some persons, of as great use as the elegance of others would have been? A reverend divine (Mr. Firmin) relateth this as the saying of a famous prelate (Bishop Brownrigg) concerning that rousing preacher Mr. John Rogers: ‘*He doth more good with his wild notes than we with our set musick.*’ Tho’ matter in a sermon is most material, yet the manner of delivering it is of no small consideration and conducibleness to people’s profit. He was one of a thousand (Mr. Finner) who hath left it under his hand, that an affectionate preacher (and such an one Mr. Wright was) doth represent as the mind so the heart of God to his hearers. Some that I knew (and I doubt not some that I knew not) found that the Lord was with and in his ministry.”

Mr. Wright was here in 1650, and turned out in 1662. Dr. Calamy was told that he afterwards conformed. But in the Continuation he recalls this, and says that he continued a Nonconformist to his death. He appears to have been a waverer. Mr. Bagshaw says that in the time of the Indulgence he never took a licence to preach, and never was a hearer of those who did so. He died during the period when the Indulgence was in force, 1672—1675. Mr. Bagshaw speaks of “his studious, rational successor.” The word “rational” here has a meaning, for he goes on to express a wish that he and some others had more esteemed one of the greatest lights the church of God had since the apostle’s times (Calvin). As to some points of doctrine, I see that one whom they admire (Mr. R. Hooker), being a great patron of conformity, has that great man of God in great honour.

The chapel in Edale was founded by the devotion of the Protestant people inhabiting that valley of vision, the names of fifteen of the chief of whom are preserved in the deed of consecration, which bears date August 3, 1634.

“I will now no longer stop the passage of my pen to Tideswell, which is near the place of my birth and was the place of my baptism, that sign and seal of the new birth. Of him who administered that ordinance to me, Mr. Greaves” (not Greavel, as in this ill-printed book), “tho’ he might not merit the title of that school-man who was entituled *The Profound Doctor*, I have heard that his very plain words were directed against the vices of his hearers, and he used that usual exercise of catechizing. Two of his next successors (Mr. Fundaby and Mr. Cross) I have seen, and not much more than seen; their labours and lives in that place being soon terminated. The third successor (Mr. Heathcote) was of considerable continuance. Of him, who could not be charged with falling short as to conformity before the war, whatever is charged on him for siding with the two Houses of Parliament in it, a character was given at his interment by an eloquent person before pointed at.”

Doubtless Mr. Wright, of Edale. Mr. Heathcote's name was Ralph, and he was born in 1650.

"After some vacancy that followed that minister's death, followed for a time (alas! a short time), reckoned not by years but by months, and those not many, the labouring of one whose attainments were far above his years, with an eye to the preserving of whose memory, as well as of that of others, this piece is penned; to wit, excellent Mr. Anthony Buxton. Of him take the following account:

"This person derived from parents well esteemed at Chalmorton (where the water that serves it springs at the upper and sinks at the lower end). So in other parts of the country. His noted studiousness and seriousness when a school-boy were as hopeful buddings of a fruitful tree.

"Providence placed him afterwards in the famous University of Cambridge and in the then flourishing College which bears the name of the all-blessed and undivided Trinity, when the renowned Dr. Hall was master; and the very learned and then moderate Dr. Templar was a Fellow, and to the best of my remembrance his tutor. I have heard one say that at that time Oxford was *Blocksford*, and of the then constitution of Cambridge some have spoken with contempt more than enough, much at the rate that a learned person (Mr. Glanville) wrote of the then ministry, who was pleased to account one worthy (Mr. Baxter) a man of account for his writing, sense and reason. But I and my betters are well satisfied that an eminently able conformist (Mr. Lawson) gives a right representation of affairs, when he saith, '*The sects did swarm, and too many disorders were too apparent at that day. Learning flourished, arts and sciences (with languages) advanced. There were never better sermons, never better books,*' &c. Sure I am, Mr. Buxton did much learn as other things, so Christ there. Of this, his choice letters to his father savoured whilst he was there; and he came thence singularly accomplished, having drank in no little of the doctrine and spirit of that then rare preacher (Mr. S. Jacomb). And shall it now be said that learning ran low there, when so many of the excellent of the earth that now fill the episcopal chairs, and that most reverend and renowned person styled Primate of all England (Dr. Stillingfleet, Dr. Patrick, Dr. Tillotson since deceased) were members thereof, and in considerable place, trust and employment therein, who I doubt not bless God on that score? Not long after his commencement he was prevailed with to preach at Mayfield, a parochial chapel within my beloved parish of Glossop, where he shewed that none were to despise his youth. And of my knowledge, some to this day bear impressions of the precious truths which with much exactness he delivered. . . . Oh that those few that sat under his ministry which ceased near forty-six years ago, may shew that God's word therein touched their hearts! He was, through the importunity of friends, and (as I believe) through hopes of being a more general instrument of furthering the work of the Lord, prevailed with to remove to Tideswell, whereof I before made mention. But, alas! he saw little more (if so much as) a quarter of a year there. He had through a saddle-bow received damage, and his modesty prevailing on him too long to conceal it, it furthered his departure. It is observed that he who laid his hands on the excellent divine poet, Mr. Herbert, when he was ordained, within three years laid his shoulder to the bier or

coffin wherein he was carried to his long home. Alas! within three months or thereabouts, I, who was called so to lay mine hands, was called to lay my shoulder on the like account. Providence ordered that I was called from home, and so was out of the hearing of his dying groans, and of that storm that his soul met with (as some excellent ministers had done) when near the haven of heaven. But the Lord brought to his bedside grave, reverend and tender Mr. Stanley, by whose mouth and ministry God spoke peace to him."

Mr. Bagshaw was requested to preach the sermon at his funeral, which he did, and has here printed the heads of his discourse. He has printed also a confession of faith drawn up by Mr. Buxton.

After him came Mr. Breboe, as the name is written on the margin of Mr. Bagshaw's book; but Mr. Beebe or Beeby, as in Dr. Calamy's work. "He was here and elsewhere," says Mr. Bagshaw, "particularly in the latter end of his time at Cirencester, industrious, apt to teach, and well esteemed. One thing was less satisfactory to his brethren, that he married his brother's widow, and defended his so doing from an order which did, as they believed, concern the Jewish nation and church only." Dr. Calamy says that he left Tideswell at the Restoration, and took charge of the chapel at Sheldon, where he was ejected. Yet when we compare this with his large account of Mr. Beeby, of Cirencester, we find a difficulty, inasmuch as that Mr. Beeby is represented as being with the army of General Monk at the time when the resolution was taken to bring back the King. At all events, he can have been very little time at Tideswell, if Dr. Calamy's account of him is correct. After him were Mr. Bryerley and Mr. Creswick, a native of Sheffield, both conformists.

Mr. Bagshaw says nothing about any minister in the church of Hathersage, and yet Mr. Robert Clarke, who was presented by the Earl of Devonshire in 1627, may seem to fall under the description of a Puritan minister, since, in 1646, he had his living augmented by the Committee for Plundered Ministers, with £30 a-year out of the rectories of Duckmanton and Normanton, sequestered from Francis, Lord Deancourt, and £9 from the tithes of Abney and Abney Grange, sequestered from Rowland Eyre, Papist and delinquent, farmer thereof, under the dean and chapter of Litchfield; also £5 from the tithe of Litton and the glebe there. He was in the receipt of his augmentation in 1653. We have no evidence that he lived to the critical year 1662, but we know that, though he had thus largely partaken of the spoils of the suffering Royalists, he did not abandon his church at the last.

The chapel at Derwent lies far remote from the parish church of Hathersage, and the Parliamentary Commissioners, in 1650, recommend that Derwent shall be constituted an independent parish. A Mr. Burdges was the minister, of whom nothing more appears to have been handed down.

They also recommend that Stony Middleton shall be made a distinct parish. There was a chapel, 400 communicants, and not above £10 maintenance for the minister. Richard Thorpe, the minister, is reported to be "scandalous for drinking;" and when the Committee voted an augmentation of £40 a-year out of the tithe of Glossop, sequestered from the Earl of Arundel and Surrey, and the Countess of Arundel, his mother, a recusant, they voted it for such minister as they shall approve. Mr. Thorpe, however, received at least a portion of it in 1650. We have no account of any resignation of the benefice.

But though Mr. Bagshaw has nothing to say of the ministers who lived in the Puritan times in this parish, he speaks with great respect of a gentleman living at the High-Low in this parish, who belongs to the class so often spoken of, the moderate conformists. This was Mr. Robert Eyre, who was a magistrate for the county, and a man of principal estate in those parts, as well as of very ancient descent. He had been left a minor by his father, and conceived that he had suffered something in his ward-time; "yet God, in wisdom and favour, ordered that he should match into the family of Mr. Barnard Wells, by which his estate was much advanced."

"His education had it appears been somewhat neglected; but such were his natural parts and acquired ones, thro' his great industry and God's great blessing, that very few of the gentry, or among the justices, did excel him. *This admits of no denial.* 1. He was eminently sound in the principles of religion and far seen into the controversies raised about it, very able to convince gainsayers. 2. Tho' his communion with God in his retirements lay most open to heaven, the fruit thereof was seen and reaped by his familiars on earth. 3. He made conscience of family worship, and freely entertained ministers that furthered him in it. 4. He that had before been a magistrate, and did exercise it afterwards, whilst monarchy was down, lived privately as a favourer of it. 5. To justice and equity he was an hearty friend. 6. Notwithstanding the satisfaction he had as to the point of conformity, he was far from presenting sober Nonconformists; and being known to have an esteem for unworthy me, informations were not given against me, and in times of bondage precious liberties (for labour) were indulged by me."

This Mr. Eyre was the head of one of the principal families of the name and stock of Eyre, that very old and widely ramified family in the Peak. His mother was a Jessop, of Broomhale, in the parish of Sheffield, who, like himself, belonged to the class of moderate conformists. The other co-heir of Mr. Wells married Henry Bradshaw, of Marple, brother to President John Bradshaw. There was a numerous family. Great acquisitions of fortune were made by his descendants, and three different members of the family took several surnames, viz., Archer, Gell and Newton, so that there was a loss of the name of Eyre in this branch of the family before all the male were passed away, which is, however, now the case.

At Eyam, Mr. Bagshaw confines himself to the notice of Mr. Thomas Stanley, who indeed seems to have deserved the praise which Mr. Bagshaw bestows upon him. He came in, however, on a title which only the circumstances of those peculiar times can justify; the preceding rector, Shirland Adams, who had held the living from the year 1630, having been dispossessed of it for his adherence to the Royal cause. The order of the Committee for Plundered Ministers is dated 29th of July, 1645: "Thomas Stanley, M.A., a godly orthodox divine, to officiate the cure as rector, and preach diligently to the parishioners." Mr. Stanley was in possession in 1650, when the Parliamentary Commissioners report him as "reputed to be an honest man." Mr. Adams, I believe, lived to return and resume possession in 1660; but he cannot have held it long, as Mr. Mompesson was the incumbent in the year of the Plague, 1666, when Eyam was so sorely visited. Mr. Stanley continued to reside at Eyam after he had ceased to be the incumbent. But of this one of the three celebrated ejected or silenced ministers of the Peak,—Ogden, Stanley and Bagshaw,—a more particular account must be given, taken from Mr. Bagshaw's volume.

"According to the account given me by his beloved son, Mr. Stanley was born at Duckmanton, three miles from Chesterfield, where he had part of his education, as he had another part of it at Staley, not far from it. His noted schoolmaster was one Mr. Marshall, whose brother made a speech to King James I. This worthy minister commenced M.A. in the 22nd year of his age. His first public employment was under Mr. Cart, at Hansworth, the famous father of a son that I knew, his famous successor there in the ministry, and grandfather of him whose fame was great as a physician. To Mr. Cart, the son, he was an instructor; for three years he was preacher at Dore chapel, in the parish of Dronfield, and eight years after at the parochial chapel of Ashford, in the parish of Bakewell; whence, by those then in power, he was, in '44, translated to the rectory of Eyam, where his labours lay 'till that black day of Bartholomew in '62, when many pastors and people knew to their sorrow what it was to be separated from their hearers. The first time that I had any cognizance of his excellent person, was in a troublesome time when there were more than rumours of wars, and he for a night put to lodge in an house where I was then tabled, who was afterwards put to flee into Cheshire and Lancashire to secure his life, when by sons of violence his goods were seized and divided amongst them. Concerning him give me leave to record—(1.) He was, by the best men that knew him, noted for one of those that were called Puritans, who by many were more than a little disgusted. (2.) Tho' he was not charged with Nonconformity before the wars, the best of those who carried that character did highly esteem him. (3.) His diligence in studying, and his zeal in sound, plain, practical preaching were worthy of (what they met with) a remark. (4.) The flocking of choice hearers from several sides (and parts) to his ministry, might from some contract envy. (5.) He was a great encourager of week-day lectures, by his preaching at them and by his presence when his juniors and seniors preached. (6.) He

was a very visible and audible confuter of those who adventure to decry free conceived prayer, adventuring to say there is no such gift, whereby persons can suit their prayers to Divine Providence, and their own particular cases with those of others. One, not the most considerate, after a zealous prayer of his, cried, '*If this speed not, he can never mend it, and he had best cease.*' . . . He had divers trials, as to his parting with other dear relations, besides that of parting with his dear, dear yoke-fellow, who was a partner with him and helper of him in all his troubles. One is (I think) living who can witness how near that breach went to his heart, whereof his weeping eyes were witnesses. When he could not serve his people publicly, some yet alive will testify how helpful he was to them in private, especially when the sickness (by way of eminency so called), I mean the pestilence prevailed in that town, he continuing with them, when, as it is written, 259 persons of ripe age and 58 children were cut off thereby. When some, who might have been better employed, moved the then noble Earl of Devonshire, Lord Lieutenant, to remove him out of the town, I am told by the credible that he said, 'It was more reasonable that the whole country should, in more than words, testify their thankfulness to him, who, together with the care of the town, had taken such care as no one else did to prevent the infection of the towns adjacent.' In the year 1670 this worthy preacher had been at the Spaw, in Yorkshire, for his health; but soon after his return he was seized with a sickness that issued in his death. Poor I was, on a Sabbath night, called out of my bed (as I remember) to visit him; whom I found in a desirable frame of spirit, tho' very weak in body; as I also found that, tho', on account of his not conforming, he had suffered much, he rejoiced that he suffered in and for that cause; within three days, even on Bartholomew-day (still called black), he expired."

Mr. Bagshaw says nothing of the ministers of Chapel-in-le-Frith, a place he knew very well, so that we may be assured they had done little to prepare the way for the Nonconformity which afterwards existed here. But he speaks highly of a layman, his own brother-in-law, Mr. Wm. Barber, of the Malcoff; and he adduces the testimony of the minister of the place, by giving the address which he delivered at the grave of this zealous professor. It rises even to something like eloquence. Mr. Oliver was the minister here in 1650, when he was charged with being disaffected to the new order of things.

And now it only remains to speak of the parish of Glossop or Glossop Dale, which I have purposely reserved to the last place, as having been the benefice from which Mr. Bagshaw himself was ejected.

[It is greatly to be regretted that Mr. Hunter did not complete this sketch; still more that a general history of the Old Dissent, for which his MSS. shew he had accumulated large materials, was not prepared by him.—ED. of C. R.]

ADDRESS AT THE OPENING OF THE SESSION OF MANCHESTER
NEW COLLEGE, LONDON, OCTOBER 12, 1863.

BY REV. JOHN JAMES TAYLER, B.A.

A THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY which undertakes to train young men for the ministry of the Christian Church, is placed in a peculiar and somewhat embarrassing relation to the sphere of scientific inquiry on one hand, and the sphere of practical usefulness on the other. Between these two spheres it stands; and each has an almost equal claim on its reverent regard. Could we exclude all thought of the living world around us, and work out our critical results with the same recklessness of consequences that the mathematician experiences in disentangling the complexities of mere quantity, the task of those whose duty it is to explore and communicate theological truth would be greatly simplified, and their responsibilities proportionally lightened. But we cannot do this. The condition of the society in which we live, the connection of its existing beliefs with the practical morality of the mass of human beings, its susceptibility of influences which may be made to involve, just as they are exhibited and applied, all the difference, momentous as it may be, between a great principle or a fatal mistake, the dependence of the proper effect of even the highest truth on the moral culture and preparedness of the minds to which it is addressed—these are facts which it would be madness to overlook, which cannot be eliminated from the practical problem set before us, but must be taken into account as elements essential to its satisfactory solution. On the other hand, were we to discard all science but such as a former age has accepted and ratified, our business as philanthropists and social reformers would certainly be disencumbered of not a few difficulties, and, for a time at least, might proceed more smoothly and pleasantly: and it is remarkable that the men who have produced the strongest impression on the religious condition of their times—Paul, Luther, Wesley—eschewed all science, and adopting without question the forms of theological thought which they found traditionally current in the world, availed themselves of the hold which these had already obtained on the surface of the human mind, to penetrate through them with a new spiritual power into its hidden depths. But scientific truth cannot be for ever kept in abeyance. However for a season the spiritual and scientific elements of our nature may beneficially subsist apart, each doing a work of its own,—a time will certainly arrive, with the fuller development of our entire humanity, when they must come into collision, and when their respective claims and mutual relationship will have to be determined by the comprehensive reason of mankind. Our Puritan forefathers were saved by the broad assumptions of the old

Protestantism from many critical perplexities which harass the scholars of the present generation. They took the whole Bible from beginning to end as literally the Word of God. All that they had to do was to ascertain what it said, and to acquiesce. It was a simple question of grammar and interpretation. If apparent contradictions to reason and the moral sense anywhere occurred, as such things could not for a moment be admitted in an infallible and divinely inspired record, it was taken for granted that they would be cleared up hereafter; they were thought to arise from our own imperfect knowledge and narrow comprehension; or they were thrown back with a reverent awe into the unsearchable depths of spiritual mysteries. But evasions like these—for answers they were not—no longer satisfy the anxious questionings of devout and earnest minds. The Sufficiency of Scripture in the old-fashioned sense can no longer be determined by a single process of argumentation *ab extra*, handing over to us as the result an absolutely authoritative instrument, where we have only to read the instructions and to obey. There is a previous question, scarcely touched on in the old books on the Evidences—how this instrument was itself put together, and how its letter must often be construed to carry its spirit into effect. In the face of conclusions established beyond the reach of all rational controversy, by such men as Bunsen, Jowett, Stanley, Davidson and Colenso (to mention only names familiar to an English audience), no one will now venture to assert, that because a thing is said in so many words in any part of Scripture, therefore it must be accepted as a declaration of positive fact or an utterance of absolute truth. Scripture has acquired a new aspect in the light cast on it by the rapid development of historical and philological science. It has ceased to be one book with an uniform character throughout, and taken the form of a multifarious literature, radiating hues of thought, all fundamentally religious in their tone, but as various as the media through which they are refracted, and none of them to be identified with the pure white light of truth which is behind them and shines through them. This revolution of opinion respecting the Bible is an accomplished fact. It is impossible for any well-informed mind to go back again to the scriptural position maintained by our ancestors. The knowledge of the age forbids it. Scripture must henceforth hold a different, though, as I shall hope to shew, a not less important place in our plan of theological study; and it becomes, therefore, one of the gravest questions of the day, especially for those who fill the office of teachers in an Academy like this—how the Scriptures, which have been, still are, and will ever be, the main source of spiritual strength and comfort to our human world, are to be viewed and handled and enforced in the altered state of enlightened belief respecting them—to keep them in harmony with a progressive science, and secure to

them not only an unenfeebled but a more exalted influence over the popular mind.

When a book, like the Bible, of very miscellaneous contents, contributed under the greatest diversities of social and mental condition some thousands of years ago in languages that are now extinct, has to be made a reliable vehicle to modern times of the spiritual influences which God has breathed into it,—three separate inquiries must be instituted by every theologian who understands his duty in its whole extent. He must first recover by a comparison of existing manuscripts, versions and citations, the nearest possible approach to the original text of the sacred books. This is the critical function. He must next endeavour by a simple and unforced application of the rules of grammar, the laws of idiomatic construction and the lights of contemporary history and literature, to ascertain what it was that the writer intended to say, without any reference in the first instance to its conformity with his own sense of truth or falsehood, of rationality or absurdity. All that he has now to do, is to interpret honestly the plain letter as it lies before him. This is the province of exegesis. Hitherto it has been generally assumed, that the whole business of the theologian was exhausted in these two processes, the critical and the exegetical. It was not held possible that any further question could remain, when the sense of Scripture had been once clearly made out. But when it is recollected that human language under the most favourable circumstances is a very imperfect medium of divine truth, that the same fundamental principles are capable of expression in very different intellectual forms, and that while principles themselves are unsusceptible of change, the forms in which they are clothed admit of indefinite expansion—it is obvious that there is a third inquiry, presupposing the former two, and more important than either of them to bring out the entire force and significance of the scriptural record; and that is, what great spiritual principle, what inextinguishable religious instinct, what unbaffled and ever-during aspiration towards the Infinite, underlies the utterances and animates the histories of the Bible, and struggles through them into intelligible expression—in other words, how we are to translate its language into some modern equivalent, and feel through the suggestions of our own spiritual consciousness, what the writer would have now said, had he attempted with our new lights and more perfect terminology to say the same thing at the present day. Without the addition of this third process, biblical studies can yield no spiritual fruit, and must degenerate into a mere branch of historical and antiquarian research.—I foresee that by those to whom this view of the subject may be new, I shall be taunted with annihilating all definite criterion of scriptural truth, and opening a door to the wildest licence of subjective speculation—that I even run some chance of being supposed

to favour the triple senses of Origen or the mystical correspondences of Swedenborg. I intend nothing of the kind. I hope to shew, that the view of Scripture language which I have ventured to maintain, and which I am convinced is necessary to rescue the Bible from being cast aside as a worn-out book of the past, so far from unsettling its deepest and real sense, can alone fix and define it by a principle that is unchanging and eternal; and even of the theories of the remarkable men just cited, I may observe, that however they failed of their object, and are justly chargeable with extravagance, they are a significant attestation of the utter inadequacy of the literal and historical sense of Scripture to satisfy the wants of the most spiritual order of minds.

In all the questionings of religious philosophy the difficulty has been to find something ultimate, on which the mind can rest as an indisputable reality. Without this we are in constant danger of reasoning in a circle—of taking the premiss for the conclusion, and the conclusion for the premiss. Catholics have based the authority of Scripture on the warrant of the Church. Protestants have established the legitimacy of the Church, the *jus divinum* of their ecclesiastical order and discipline, on the witness of Scripture. In one case, Scripture stood on the Church. In the other, the Church stood on Scripture. In both cases there was an assumption, but no proof. In what relation do we perceive Church and Scripture to stand towards each other now? Neither of them can claim to be primal authorities. Both are derivative and secondary. Both of them are products of one and the same Spirit. The Spirit created the Church before it created Scripture, and gradually drew out Scripture from the bosom of the Church as an expression of its deepest thought and living consciousness. Neither Scripture nor the Church would be anything more to us than mere historical phenomena, without the unbroken continuity of the work of the Spirit in the hearts of believers. This it is which makes them living members of the Church, and enables them to appropriate in all their strength, as unquestionable realities, through their own personal experience, the promises and consolations of Scripture. The Quakers were the first in modern times who put forth in its whole breadth this great doctrine of the Spirit, as transcending all Church ordinances and superior in authority to Scripture itself—in fact, the common fountain of both. It was afterwards taken up in a modified form in this country by the Wesleys, and wielded by them, with a power which only reality could give, in the conversion of multitudes immersed till then in the depths of practical heathenism. It still remains the greatest of all the truths contained in Christianity, standing in this peculiar relation to Christ himself:—without it, we could never have appreciated the greatness and beauty of his person, and felt how divine it is, because there would have been a want of sympathy and mutual intelligence between us

and Christ; on the other hand, without the historical presentation of that person, we could never have formed any adequate conception of the change which the Spirit is capable of working in our humanity, and of the perfect union in which absolute self-surrender to its influences finally issues between God and man.

Let me explain a little more fully what I mean by the Spirit and its working, and its realization in Jesus Christ. The wise and fruitful use of Scripture must depend henceforth on a right apprehension of this subject. All spiritual substance, involving consciousness, affection, will, and the sense of right and wrong, is of one nature and quality—in God and in men. But God gives; man receives. The Spirit is the link of sympathy between God and man. It is the influence which makes man conscious of the presence of a Living God; and its work consists in kindling the affections, vivifying the moral perceptions, and strengthening the resolves, which bring the human will into harmony with the divine. I do not say that the operations of the Spirit were wholly unfelt in heathenism. On the contrary, I believe it has ever touched and purified the souls of the wisest and best in all religions. Nevertheless, a multiplicity in the objects of worship—especially when these symbolized the physical forces of the universe or the carnal instincts of human nature—must have impeded and stifled its influence. Only as men caught a glimpse of the One All-perfect Being, and clothed Him with the highest moral attributes which they could conceive, were their souls placed in the right attitude for receiving directly on them and in its full force that kindling power which we call the Spirit of God. It was the possession of this view of Deity—as one, as holy, as subsisting in the closest moral relationship with man—which constituted the peculiar distinction of the Hebrew race, and has stamped its character on the whole of their history and literature. The belief in its earliest forms was crude, imperfect, even gross. But great as was the darkness which enveloped it, on one side it was always open to the light, and hence it grew through the vitality which the Spirit infused into it from above. It was sustained by the sense of constant nearness and unobstructed access to a Living God. The whole Bible is a witness to this great fact: and there is nothing like it in any other history or literature. Pindar and Sophocles are remarkable for a certain piety of sentiment among the Greeks, and in no ancient people was the moral sense more carefully developed by its great philosophical teachers; but it is after all a sort of æsthetic piety, a certain symmetrical correspondence of human affections to the order and harmony of the actual universe—nothing which penetrates through mere phenomena to the living heart within them—nothing which carries the human soul into direct communion with a Spirit all-holy and all-righteous—nothing analogous to the contrition, the self-abasement, the trust, the aspiration, the

devotion, that we meet with in the prophecy and sacred song of the Hebrews.

We find here the true point of view for estimating the value and right use of the Bible. Looked at with the cold eye of a worldly criticism, it stands before us as a simple piece of history interwrought with its contemporaneous literature—often curious, romantic and beautiful, not seldom also repulsive and terrible; but when we detect that great idea of a kingdom of God which animates it throughout, of man's direct subjection and responsibility to the invisible Lord of conscience—that dim foreboding of a final communion between God and man, towards which the yearnings and endeavours of its saints and its heroes were constantly directed, we begin to feel—once caught by the spirit in which its deeds were acted and its words spoken—that it is something more than mere history and mere literature—a revelation of God in our humanity—in the struggles of successive generations to come nearer to God as their Father, and to live in filial harmony with him. And these things have been recorded, not to shape our actions or mould the form of our faith—as though we were to think and speak and act in all things as prophets and apostles did—but, through the kindling influence which goes forth from their great examples, to bring our souls under the influence of the same Spirit,—to send us with the same concentration of ardent purpose to the one only Source of grace and truth,—to imbue us with their love, their reverence, their patience, their trust, their self-abandonment to truth and right,—to make us, under altered circumstances, with more knowledge, with ampler powers, in heart and will spiritually one with them. The lessons of Scripture come to us through the personalities of Scripture; but personalities as such can only act through the sympathy which they inspire. The part of our nature on which their vivifying influence falls, is not the understanding, but the seat of our moral sense and the affections—the soul; and the power which they exert, is not that of abstract truth, but of the Spirit which gives to truth its moral quality and application. The work of the Spirit in man's progressive approximation to God, ever working himself more free from the animal, and seizing more and more of the spiritual, which is the great fact lying at the root of the whole of the Old-Testament history and literature—reached its height and found its completion in Christ: but his influence is of the same kind and works through the same media as that of the prophets who preceded him—the sympathy which unites all spiritual natures—which renders them mutually intelligible, and enables the higher to attract and command the lower. The Spirit wrought its perfect work in Christ. It came not in intermittent gushes, but was given to him without measure. It was the permanent inspiration of his whole being. In his own emphatic language, it made him one with God. Nor let this be

deemed the unwarranted assertion of a technical theologian. It is a fact which history and the present consciousness of civilized man fully attests. When the point of view has been once reached which puts man's moral nature in the true relation towards God, it is a position which can never more be disturbed. It is as unalterable as the mutual relation of its objects. It cannot be affected by any change in the scientific ideas or outward condition of the human race. It is not a dogma of the intellect, but an attitude of the soul. There can be but one true attitude of the soul towards God, of the filial towards the Parent, of the finite towards the Infinite, Mind. There can be but one true worship, which is that of the Father in spirit and in truth. When these have been once discovered, they assert themselves by their own self-evidencing truth, and remain with the human soul as a possession for ever. No one who believes in a Living God and is conscious of a spiritual nature within himself, can doubt that the love, the humility, the reverence, the self-surrender, the present grasp of immortality which we behold in Christ, express the true relation of the human child to its Heavenly Father, and realize in that historical form the permanent religion of our race. Even Renan, the most recent and certainly not the least daring of modern expositors of the Life of Jesus, has eloquently maintained the finality of his religion, and urged the world to seek its spiritual renovation not in any new theories, but in going back to his simple faith, and drawing out of it with new conviction and nobler consistency the principles of unsuspected power and blessing which it still contains.

A deep truth is shadowed forth in the popular doctrine of the Incarnation, which meets one of the strongest cravings of the human heart. We want to feel that God is actually with us in our humanity, that we can lay hold of a present and living God. It has been urged, not without plausibility, against the deistical theory of the universe, and even against some of the earlier phases of Unitarianism,—that by representing God in too abstract a light as a simple Power of wisdom and goodness, separated by an immense and impassable barrier of second causes from all direct contact with the minds of men, and assuming—which is another postulate of the same theory—that He created the universe in time,—it involves two very desolate conclusions: first, that God, whose nature and essence is Love, must have passed a long and weary eternity wholly without sympathy and companionship; and secondly, that God is not *in*, but *beyond*, our humanity, and that consequently man is cut off from all immediate communion with his Father in heaven. Arguments for the orthodox dogmas of the Trinity and the Incarnation have been derived from the assumed inevitableness of these repulsive consequences from the doctrine of simple Unitarianism; and a theological school of the present day, distinguished for the learning

and thought of its leaders, finds in the same view a strong support of its favourite theory,—that the Word dwelt from all eternity as a Son in the bosom of the Father, the archetype of our future humanity, realized on earth in the person of Jesus Christ, and embracing as members of its mystic body every child of man that is born into the world. For this duality in the Godhead I confess myself unable to discover any ground in reason or in scripture. If there be any dualism traceable in nature, it is that grand antagonism between good and evil which the older Parsism recognized, but which was itself resolved in the later developments of the system into a higher unity. I can also understand how the mutual relationship and joint agency of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, as they are set forth in the original preaching of Christianity, and especially as they are exhibited in the Gospel of John, should have given occasion in the early Church to a Sabellian conception of the Trinity. But I cannot see what there is to justify the hypothesis of two Divine Persons equally good, one a mere reflection of the other, subsisting together for the sake of intercourse from all eternity. When the polytheistic aspect of the universe, which would most naturally suggest itself to the sensuous apprehensions of uncultivated man, is once abandoned in the movement towards higher generalizations, I am unable to perceive where that movement could rationally stop till it rested in the final Unity; and the plainest utterances of the grand intuitions of both Testaments, Old and New, are in favour of the same conclusion. If ever there were a monotheistic book in the world, it is the Bible. To call simple Unitarianism, as some have called it, a theological assumption, is itself an assumption, till it can be shewn that the onward progress of human thought from the polytheism in which it apparently commenced, is at any point legitimately arrested, short of a full recognition of the absolute Unity which enfolds and consecrates all things. History helps us to an explanation of the polytheistic element which still lingers in the bosom of a traditional Christianity. We can put our finger on the very point in time and space where this hypostatizing philosophy, transforming ideas into persons, had its origin. It was a product of the decline of an older and nobler philosophy—one of those transitional forms of thought which mark the passage from an earlier to a later civilization, and which the Church arrested and made its own, and has associated with very different tendencies of mind. It is a tendency which, left to itself, would have had a far more varied development than was permitted by the Church. It would not have been confined to a single manifestation. The Word would not then have stood alone among its results. In the freer scope opened to it by the New Platonism, it interposed many other hypostases between τὸ Ἐν and the human mind. The Gnosticism of the second century furnishes ample evidence of its natural working.

What recommends this theory of a Divine Logos to some minds, is the readier conception which it seems to furnish of a personal God, and the more intimate bond of union which it is thought to establish between God and man. But there is nothing in the simple doctrine of the Divine Unity to necessitate the offensive consequences that have been drawn from it—to make God a solitary, distant Power, or to exclude the human soul from the loving warmth of his fatherly embrace. Space and time are conditions of being which we cannot predicate of God. As it is impossible to conceive of a time when He was not, or of any limit to his omnipresence, so it is equally impossible to conceive of Him as inactive. An inert Spirit is a contradiction in terms. But if active, He must have employed that activity in realizing the thoughts of an infinite Wisdom and Love—in giving birth everywhere and unceasingly to endless forms and conditions of existence. I cannot think of Him in repose. My only idea of his being is that of beneficent activity. An universe must therefore have always co-existed with a God. The two ideas are to me inseparable. Not as though the universe existed through any inherent force of its own. It has its being in God. It is an effect eternally issuing from the essential activity of God. We make creation subsequent to the Creator, because in the order of thought the effect must come after its cause. This view of the relation of the universe to its Divine Cause relieves us from the necessity of supposing that the Infinite Spirit existed through a whole eternity in lonely, unshared grandeur and blessedness. To the Supreme Being there can be no distinction of past and present and future. They lie before Him as one vast and present conception, wrought out in a continuous evolution of corresponding phenomena, and furnishing an exhaustless source of benevolent interest and affection. The system of the universe, so far as we can trace it, is a continuous development—the orders of creatures as they successively come into existence, continually approaching nearer to God in fulness of being, in richness of faculty, in capacity of enjoyment, in intelligence, affection, will and moral feeling. Wherein then lies the philosophical necessity for an archetypal man existing from all eternity to solace the loneliness of God, when the same end is more effectually accomplished by his omnipresent grasp and anticipated fruition of the great ideal of humanity as it unfolds itself through the eternity to come, growing more and more into the likeness of Christ, as an object of ineffable sympathy and complacent regard? God acts out his own eternal thought in the utterances, the aspirations and endeavours of those who are conscious of his presence and strive after a future of more perfect communion with Him. This is the revelation which God makes of Himself to our human world. This is the true incarnation of the Son of God—the progressive working out of that ideal of humanity which was from

the beginning with the Father of man. This is the fundamental idea lying deep in the nature of man, brought out and vivified by the influence of pure religion—the sense of the right, the just and the true, and the striving after something higher and nobler than our actual state—which secures the unity of our race through all its changes of outward condition and amidst the ceaseless growth of its intellectual acquisitions, which raises it step by step out of animalism into spirituality, which links it with the everlasting God, and gives it the earnest of an immortal heritage in Him. So God comes into our world and reconciles it with Himself. Out of this deep-seated idea springs the word of prayer and trust and hope, which, sometimes obscurer, sometimes more distinct, sometimes darkened with human passion, sometimes bright with the flame of heavenly love, goes up into the listening ear of the omnipresent Father, and, however strange the accents in which it is uttered, makes itself everywhere and always understood by that spiritual sympathy which penetrates into devout hearts through all the barriers of speech and nationality and age. To comprehend and interpret this universal language of religion is the highest function of a true theologian. It is in fact to understand our humanity itself; for religion is a reflection of the noblest aspect of our humanity. God comes and dwells in our humanity when it is earnestly turned towards Him in the spirit of Christ. To be fully conscious of this presence of God, to understand our filial relation towards Him, and to give ourselves up with childlike docility to the leadings of his Spirit, is the most perfect conception that we can form on earth of a divine revelation. Every mental change implied in that solemn word, Salvation, is involved in this spiritual state, and springs out of it by a sort of organic growth—contrition, penitence, atonement, sanctification, final peace.

If these views of the religious nature of man, of its relation to God, and of the Bible which records its deepest experiences and its sublimest utterances, are just,—they suggest the two main directions which the public teaching of our churches and the preparatory studies of our colleges ought henceforth to take. First and before all things, as the indispensable foundation of everything else, an earnest cultivation of the spirit of Christ, as the highest expression of the soul in its intercourse with God, as a true incarnation of the Divine in the human; and this, not only from Scripture, not only from the pregnant revelations of its working in the brief fragmentary notices of the Gospels and in the testimony of apostolic experience, but also, and in some respects even more, from the present facts of a living Christianity, and the secret witness of our own souls in their struggles to rise into light and come into the presence of God. Here is a side of our being which has never yet been explored as it deserves in the spirit of a philosophy which is at once reverential

and free. Here is a field of the richest psychology opened before us,—to search into the roots of the religious trusts and aspirations of man; to investigate under their religious aspects the ideas of moral obligation and responsibility; to ascertain the grounds of faith and determine the conditions of spiritual insight beyond the phenomenal; and to embrace in a comprehensive survey the moral, religious and spiritual progress of mankind. Secondly, the application of this spirit of Christ to the interpretation of the religious history and literature which prepared and announced its advent, and for the clear separation, by the unfailing test which it supplies, of the divine and the human elements which are so largely commingled in them. Here also is a field out of which the rich products which it is capable of yielding, have never yet been fully reaped. Here is a fertile soil which has remained comparatively barren, in consequence of the old-fashioned husbandry to which it has been subjected. The improved implements of philology and criticism, which have produced such copious harvests in other fields, are kept away from this, as if there were something impious in their use. We know not what great and unsuspected truths may yet break forth from God's word, when once it is handled honestly. There is a history and a literature shut up in the Bible, the true worth of which has never yet been appreciated, the surpassing beauty of which has never yet been relished, because never yet has it been brought into fair and open contact with humanity; because the full warmth and glow of the mind, needful to ripen its latent seeds of truth and beauty, has never yet been allowed to fall on it—pure taste, natural sympathies, an unpervverted moral sense, and an unstrained application of the critical test of the false and the true.

These larger views of religion and the Bible, if consistently carried out, must be as productive of rich practical results, as they simplify the course and widen the intellectual horizon of the student. What complaints do we hear on all sides of the inefficacy of the public services of the church! How often is the sermon referred to as an insufferable infliction, which people submit to merely as a conventional necessity! And why is this? Because nature, simplicity and freedom are too often banished from the pulpit: because the preacher is doomed to tread a weary round of platitudes and truisms, which the world may not dispute, but does not therefore believe; and on themes where interest is intense, and thought ever active, and thousands would gladly hear a true and honest word, he must only speak what is prescribed. Why should not the teacher of religion go to the Bible, as he would go to any other ancient history and literature—simply to see it as it is, and to unfold the ideas which it contains—with that reverent feeling which the spirit of truthfulness always inspires, and that genuine humanity which cannot dwell on any record of our race without a heart of sympathy? Let the Psalms

be explained and applied with that keen sense of beauty and delicate perception of high and holy sentiment, with which a scholar of taste and feeling would interpret the Odes of Pindar; let the picturesque touches and the curious traces of antique manners and belief be brought out with the same fidelity and unreservedness from the books of Samuel and Kings, as a classical commentator would use in expounding the histories of Herodotus; and hearers would soon begin to feel that there was a human element in these things with which they could not but sympathize, and because human, therefore divine. Upon an interest thus awakened, however little it might contribute to build up a doctrinal system, it would be easy to found those searching appeals to the common heart and conscience of our humanity, in which the divinest lessons of religion are constantly conveyed. Canon Stanley's Lectures on the Jewish Church furnish an admirable example of the way in which the narratives of the Bible may be invested at once with all the interest of a romantic history and all the moral influence of a sermon. I am sure that here is a means of imparting new freshness and vitality to religious teaching, which may be employed with the greatest advantage by those who have acquired the competent learning and know how to use it with a reverent freedom. What I have said of the Old Testament applies as much to the New. We must get at its religion through its history,—not through the elaboration of doctrines separated from the circumstances under which they were delivered, and which unavoidably modified the form of their enunciation,—but through fervent sympathy with the words and actions of men who were the vehicles of its living spirit and who made up its history. There is a still wider range of pulpit instruction than that which I have just indicated. It is right in the first instance to get the spirit of the Bible direct from the study of the Bible—the spirit of Christ from the history of Christ. But when we have seized that spirit and verified its authenticity, then must we apply it in the broadest way to all the interests and concerns of human life, bringing the whole world—its pleasures, its businesses, its politics—within the scope and influence of Christianity, and resolutely effacing the artificial distinction between things secular and spiritual. Everything human has in it the essential matter of religion. We must establish our title to the Christian name, we must prove the identity of our mission with that of Christ and his apostles, by shewing that the same spirit which made them what they were, is still at work among us; that it brings us, like them, into communion with the Living God; that it keeps open for us, as for them, the passage from earth to heaven;—that as, in that first age, God was in Christ reconciling an alienated world to Himself, so is He now in us, just in proportion to our fidelity and earnestness, giving us, as we are one in heart and aim with Christ, the same

victory over the sin and evil of the world. Such appears to me the way in which the gospel should be now preached, to make it still a living message to the world; and the very freedom with which an honest criticism compels us to use the primitive records of the Bible, instead of impairing its authority, only extends and deepens its moral and spiritual power.

To descend, ere I conclude, from these general observations to the special business and prospects of our Institution, especially in its relations with University College and the University of London, I have great pleasure in making the following statement. In the classes of University College, Mr. John Ainsworth, lay student in his third year, gained the fourth certificate in the extra Greek class, and the fifth in the senior Latin; Mr. A. N. Blatchford, divinity student, third year, seventh certificate in senior Latin, and seventh in senior Greek; Mr. R. A. Armstrong, divinity student, third year, fourth certificate, senior Latin, and ninth, senior Greek; Mr. J. E. Carpenter, divinity student, third year, first prize in extra Greek, second prize in senior Latin, and first prize in the junior Mathematical section of Natural Philosophy; Mr. C. T. Poynting, divinity student, first year, first prize in the lower junior Mathematics; Mr. W. Wiles, divinity student, first year, fourth certificate in junior Latin. In the University of London, Mr. Poynting and Mr. Wiles both matriculated in the first class; Mr. P. H. Wicksteed passed his first B.A. examination in the second class, pass examination, but afterwards went in for honours, and obtained the third place in Latin. At the second B.A. examination, Mr. E. Odgers passed in the first class, and gained the scholarship in Classics: Mr. L. M. Aspland, also a student in Manchester New College, passed in the first class, and gained the scholarship in Logic and Moral Philosophy; Mr. Aspland further obtained the gold medal on taking his M.A. degree in the department of Mental and Moral Philosophy. This is satisfactory evidence of the industry and proficiency of our students during the past session, and may reasonably inspire us with good hope for the future. Let me urge on them to persevere in their efforts, that they may sustain the credit of their Alma Mater, and not disappoint the expectations which they have so far encouraged their friends to entertain; and above all, let me entreat those who are preparing for the ministry, to regard their literary and scientific attainments as but the preliminary implements and materials of a far nobler work—the service of divine truth and the moral elevation of mankind. May this College and its associated Institution in University Hall, now so happily united with it under the auspices of its excellent Principal, Mr. Beesly—long continue to work heartily together in one spirit and with a common aim, and send forth year after year a succession of able and accomplished men to fulfil with highminded fidelity their various duties to the church and the world!

NOTES ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

EZEKIEL xxx. 18: "When I shall break there the sceptres of Egypt, and the pomp of her strength shall cease in her."

The Authorized Version has "the yokes of Egypt." But the writer seems to point to the long staff of dignity which we see upon the monuments held in the hand by a man of rank, perhaps indeed by every landowner. Among the Israelites this was called the "staff of inheritance."

Ezekiel xxx. 15: "I will pour out my wrath upon Sin [or Sais], the strength of Egypt."

The margin of our Bibles explains Sin as the city of Pelusium, but the Septuagint reads Sais. As Pelusium is elsewhere named Shur, I lean to the opinion of the Septuagint, more particularly because at this time Sais had been for upwards of one hundred years the capital of Egypt, and it is hard to suppose that it would not be mentioned by Ezekiel, when he mentions so many other Egyptian towns, and some of smaller size.

Ezekiel xxxi. 11: "I will therefore deliver him into the hand of the God of the nations; he shall surely deal with him."

By the God of the nations we must understand the devil, and to him the Egyptians are to be given up for their enmity to Israel. The Authorized Version for "God" reads "the mighty one;" leaving it doubtful who is spoken of.

Ezekiel xxxii. 21: "The mighty gods shall speak to him out of the midst of hell with them that help him."

Here also we seem to find mention of devils; and as the belief in such beings is supposed to have reached Judea from the East, we need not be surprised at finding traces of it in the book of Ezekiel, which was written while he was living as a captive in the hands of the Babylonians.

Ezekiel xxxi. 14: "They are all delivered unto death, to the world below, in the midst of the sons of Adam, with them that are gone down to the pit."

The Authorized Version has "nether parts of the earth," instead of "to the world below," which is less literal, and seems less to describe the hell which the prophet is here writing about.

Ezekiel xxxiv. 18: "Is it a small thing for you . . . to have drunk of the shallow waters, but ye must foul the residue with your feet?"

The Authorized Version has "deep waters;" upon which I would remark that the Hebrew word means "depressed," "sunk down;" and further that deep waters might have been drunk freely without blame, and could not easily be fouled. In a

former paper I proposed a similar correction for Ezekiel xxxii. 14, where the prophet threatens Egypt with making its waters shallow. To make the Egyptian waters deep would be to confer a blessing on the country.

Ezekiel xxxix. 10: "They shall take no wood out of the field, neither cut down any out of the forests, for they light their fires with the weapons."

They shall use these weapons of the enemy for their ordinary fuel, and so numerous are they that they will serve them for seven years. The Authorized Version has here, and in the verse above, "They shall burn the weapons with fire," thus not letting us know that they are thereby to save their fuel.

Ezekiel xliii. 13—17: "And these are the measures of the Altar after the cubits: The cubit is a cubit and an hand-breadth. And the basin shall be a cubit, even the breadth a cubit; and the border thereof by the edge thereof round about shall be a span. And this shall be the upper face of the Altar. And from the basin to its ground even to the platform below it shall be two cubits; and the breadth one cubit. And from the lesser platform even to the greater platform shall be four cubits; and the breadth one cubit. So the Harel-altar [or Mount of God] shall be four cubits. And from the Ariel-altar [or Lion of God] and upward shall be four horns. And the Ariel-altar shall be twelve cubits long, twelve broad, square in the four sides thereof. And the platform shall be fourteen cubits long, and fourteen broad in the four sides thereof; and the border about it shall be half a cubit; and the basin thereof shall be a cubit about; and its steps shall look toward the east."

The description of this curious altar is not so complete as to enable us to make a picture of it; but from the above translation the reader will have no difficulty in understanding that it was a lofty pyramid, standing on a base fourteen cubits square, above which rose three shallow basins, all of them square, of twelve cubits, of four cubits, and of two cubits; so that the blood of the victims, if it overflowed from the upper altar, would fall upon that which was below it.

Jeremiah xxvi. 18: "Zion shall be plowed like a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps of ruins, and the Mountain [or Harel-altar] of the House as idolatrous altars in the forest."

The Authorized Version has, "and the mountain of the house as the high places of a forest," thus leaving us entirely in the dark as to what objects the prophet means to describe in either half of his simile. But this passage is explained by our former note on Ezekiel xliii. 13.

Ezekiel xlvi. 20: "This is the place where the priests shall cook the guilt-offering and the sin-offering."

The Authorized Version has "boil," but we are told in the

law that these offerings were never to be dressed otherwise than by roasting.

Ezekiel xlv. 25: "In the seventh month, on the fifteenth day of the month, on the Feast [that is of Tabernacles], he shall do the like for seven days."

At this time the Feast of Tabernacles, as we see in other places, was called emphatically the Feast; it needed no other name. But the Authorized Version, altering the order of the above words, calls it the Feast of the seven days.

S. S.

FAWCETT'S POLITICAL ECONOMY.*

POLITICAL ECONOMY labours under the disadvantage of being a science which treats of common things. The production and distribution of wealth are matters which so nearly affect all, that few are able to consider themselves—none would willingly be considered by others—as entirely ignorant of the principles on which they depend. We often meet with people who confess that they do not understand optics or geology, but it is seldom that we find any one who does not regard himself as an authority on the Income-tax, the Bank Charter Act or the Value of Gold. The consciousness of ignorance is the beginning of knowledge; and it is precisely because people imagine that they can comprehend economical questions without trouble, that political economy is perhaps less accurately known than any other science. A short time ago, a friend of our own, who, albeit an intelligent and successful trader, frequently shewed in conversation his want of knowledge of economical science, was induced to take up the work which we are reviewing; after reading a few pages he threw down the book in disgust, because, as he said, "it was so simple."

Notwithstanding this discouraging example, we think that Mr. Fawcett's book may be expected to do much to spread a knowledge of the science it expounds. Many will read it who never read anything on the subject before; and though a single perusal will not make the reader an economist, it will save him from many vulgar errors and enable him to understand that economical questions are far more complex than is commonly supposed. Avowedly popular, this Manual is far from being superficial. It is mainly founded on the great work of Mr. John Stuart Mill, —a fact which by no means detracts from its value—but contains original chapters on subjects of recent interest, such as Co-operative Societies, Strikes and Trades-unions, and the Effects of the recent Gold Discoveries.

* A Manual of Political Economy. By Henry Fawcett, M.A., Fellow of Trinity Hall, Cambridge. Crown 8vo. Pp. 587. Macmillan and Co. 1863.

Mr. Fawcett fails, we think, to state with sufficient force the difficulties which render the various communistic schemes of Owen, Fourier and St. Simon, altogether impracticable. He is perhaps unconsciously influenced by a reaction against the harsh treatment inflicted by critics on the promoters of these schemes, men who, whatever their errors, were for the most part actuated by none but disinterested and benevolent motives.

The chapter on Trades-unions and Strikes is worthy of the attention of the more thoughtful portion of the working classes. Mr. Fawcett's inclinations are all on the popular side, but he does not indulge in any of that indiscriminating praise and nauseous flattery of the people of which we have lately had too much. Trades-unions serve the double purpose of ordinary friendly societies and of combinations to raise wages. In the former capacity, they do not call for any remark; in the latter, many of their actions are unjust and illegal. Mr. Fawcett fully concedes the right of the workmen to combine; nor do we see how it can justly be denied, so long as a similar right is claimed and exercised by their employers. Moreover, he thinks that this power of combination may often enable the workmen in a particular trade to obtain more promptly the increase of wages which always eventually attends the special prosperity of the trade. He points out that it is not true, as is often stated, that strikes have always failed, and enumerates several instances in which they have been completely successful. But, on the other hand, he dwells on the sufferings endured by the working classes during strikes, the great majority of which have entirely failed to secure their object; and deprives the labourers of the gloomy satisfaction of thinking that, in an unsuccessful strike, they have some compensation for their own calamities in the losses inflicted on their masters, by shewing that those losses, in diminishing the capital or wage-fund of the employer, serve to perpetuate perhaps for years the misfortunes of the workmen. Strikes have generally taken place when trade has been bad and the employers have attempted to reduce wages. But as the labourers claim, and fairly claim, to share in the additional gains of a period of high prosperity, so they ought to be willing to bear their share of the burthens of a time of depression. Where trade is so bad that the employers find it necessary to effect a considerable reduction in wages, profits are generally brought down to little or nothing; so that it matters little to the masters whether they continue their occupation or allow their capital to be idle. At such a time, it is most impolitic on the part of the workmen to strike; the injury that they do is almost entirely to themselves.

Many of the unions have endeavoured, and not without success, to raise wages by limiting the number of those who can be employed in their particular trade. Thus, in the hat trade, a master-workman is not permitted to take more than two apprentices.

Mr. Fawcett strongly insists upon the injustice and impolicy of such regulations. They are unjust, because they interfere with the right which every human being has to employ his labour as he pleases; and further, because, in so far as they are successful, they artificially raise wages in one trade, by forcing labour into other trades, and so confiscating a portion of the wages of the labourers in the latter. They are impolitic, because, by increasing the difficulties of employers, they may render them unable to compete with producers in other places, and so drive the trade entirely away from a district. The opposition made by the workmen to the introduction of machinery drove many trades away from Birmingham; and it seems not improbable that the frightful outrages committed at Sheffield upon workmen who have not joined the trades-unions, may result in the migration of the steel trade. Mr. Fawcett is not so sparing as some of the pretended friends of the people, in his denunciations of the interference with liberty practised by some of the trades-unions, which has in Sheffield attained its perfection in destruction of property, violence and murder. We can only trust that the time may soon come when the respectable and honest working men, and we do not doubt that there are many such at Sheffield, will determine to wipe off the disgrace which such acts as these bring upon their class and their institutions, by not merely refusing to unite with those who are capable of them, but by being themselves the first to discover and denounce the offenders.

We share Mr. Fawcett's pleasure in turning from the consideration of Strikes and Trades-unions to that of Co-operative Institutions. As many people have a strong prejudice against co-operative stores and co-operative trading associations without exactly knowing what they are, we extract the very interesting account which Mr. Fawcett gives of the rise of the co-operative movement.

"The cooperative movement in England was first commenced in Rochdale. About the year 1844, a few working men in that town suspected, and no doubt justly so, that they were paying a high price for tea, sugar, and other such articles, which they at the same time believed were not free from adulteration. They therefore said, 'Why should we not club together sufficient, amongst ourselves, to purchase a chest of tea and a hogshead of sugar from some wholesale shop in Manchester?' This they did, and each one of their number was supplied with tea and sugar from this common stock, paying ready money for it, and giving the same price for it as they had been charged at the shops. When all the tea and sugar had been thus sold, they agreed to divide the money which was thus realised, amongst themselves, in proportion to the capital which each individual had subscribed. They did not expect to secure any considerable profit; the object they had in view was not so much to obtain a good investment, as to avoid purchasing adulterated articles. But they found, not a little to their surprise, that a very large profit had been realised. The great advantage of the plan became self-evident,

for not only were they provided with a lucrative investment for their savings, but they obtained unadulterated tea and sugar at the same price as they had been previously obliged to pay for these same articles when their quality was deteriorated by all kinds of adulteration. A fresh stock of tea and sugar was, of course, purchased. Other labourers were quickly attracted to join the plan, and subscribe their savings; soon the society was sufficiently extended to justify them in taking a room, which they used as a store, and the success of the plan fully kept pace with its enlargement.

"In 1856, this society, now become famous as the Rochdale Pioneers, possessed a capital of about 12,900*l*. The business was not long restricted to articles of grocery; bread, meat and clothing were all sold on the same plan. Their capital so rapidly increased, that they were soon enabled to erect expensive steam flour-mills; and a supply of pure bread, as well as unadulterated tea, was thus insured. During the last few years, this Pioneers' Society has attracted frequent public attention; for it has gradually grown into a vast commercial institution, embracing a great variety of trades. At the present time its capital is 32,000*l*., the annual amount of business done is 170,000*l*., and the profits realised are twenty per cent. The general management of this society, and the mode in which the profits are distributed, are both most excellently arranged. A ready money system is so scrupulously adhered to, that even a large shareholder cannot make the smallest purchase on credit. The managers of the business are chosen by the general body of shareholders, and in almost every case a most admirable selection has been made. The accounts are made up quarterly, and placed before a general meeting. London accountants have audited these accounts, and they express a unanimous opinion, that no business in the country is better conducted. With regard to the distribution of the profits, a sufficient sum is first allotted to pay a dividend of five per cent. on the capital; the remaining profits are divided according to the following plan. Every person, when he purchases goods, receives one or more tin tickets, on which is recorded the amount of his purchases. At the end of every quarter, each person brings these tin tickets, which form a record of his aggregate purchases, and the remaining profits are distributed in proportion to the aggregate amount which each individual has expended at the store. Thirteenpence in the pound is the average amount which in this manner is received as a drawback."—Pp. 277—279.

Mr. Fawcett attributes the remarkable success which has hitherto attended almost all the co-operative stores conducted on the same plan as that above described—first, to the ready-money system which avoids bad debts and enables a far larger business to be done with a certain capital than could be done if credit were allowed; and, secondly, to the fact that in the shareholders, each store has a nucleus of customers, and is therefore certain of having some trade from the very beginning. The demand for the necessaries of life which these stores supply, is little liable to fluctuation, and they are therefore subject to very slight risk of loss through slackness of trade. Against these advantages must be set the disadvantage, which they share with all joint-stock companies, that the paid managers lack the motive

of self-interest which actuates the individual proprietor of a business to put forth energy and acquire skill. This difficulty need not, however, be insuperable, as the managers might be chosen from the larger shareholders, or their remuneration made dependent on the amount of trade.

But in addition to these stores, co-operative manufacturing associations have come into existence. The success of these is very doubtful. Hitherto such associations have for the most part gone into the cotton trade, one of the most speculative (Mr. Fawcett says *the* most speculative) in the country. At Rochdale a mill was completed in 1860 at a cost of £45,000. When the business was prosperous, the profits were at first divided as follows. A dividend of five per cent. was paid upon capital; one half of the remaining profits was paid as an extra dividend on capital, and the other half was given as a bonus to the labourers; each man's share being proportioned to the amount of wages he had received. As the labourers received the ordinary wages of the trade in the first instance, this bonus was so much extra; hence the society could obtain the best workmen, and afforded them an adequate motive to exert themselves to the utmost. But, unfortunately, many of the workmen employed were not shareholders; hence an apparent opposition of interest arose, and eventually the bonus to the labourers was discontinued. The principle of co-operation, that labour and capital should belong to the same person, and that the workman should have a direct interest in the prosperity of the business which gives him employment, was thus lost sight of, and the society became a mere joint-stock concern, subject to the peculiar disadvantage of having needy shareholders, who would always be eager to divide the last penny, especially if, as has since happened, times of distress should come about. On the whole, therefore, Mr. Fawcett is strongly in favour of co-operative stores, but discourages co-operative trading societies, especially when they enter into speculative trades.

In the chapter on the Value of Money we notice an error which will doubtless be corrected in another edition. Mr. Fawcett says (p. 366), "If the price of all commodities rise one hundred per cent., the value of gold must inevitably fall one hundred per cent.," &c. If the value of gold were to fall one hundred per cent., gold would be worth nothing. It should be, "the value of gold must inevitably fall *fifty* per cent.," &c.

We must object to an opinion expressed by Mr. Fawcett at the end of his very fair discussion of the income-tax. After mentioning the frauds often practised by tax-payers who are able to conceal the amount of their incomes, he says:

"The inequality which is caused by this power of evasion is not by many so much objected to as the general immorality which they conceive to be produced by such taxation. It is, for instance, maintained

that the income-tax places so great a premium upon deception, that many who would otherwise be honourable, are tempted to deceive the government. We hardly think, however, that a statesman ought to pay much attention to such an argument. The morality of those individuals who are so easily led away from the paths of virtue and honour is scarcely worth the fostering care of a government."—P. 546.

We believe that many persons who in every other transaction of life are perfectly honourable, habitually violate probity in this matter. They regard the tax-gatherer as boys do the school-master—as one against whom anything is fair. This does not make the practice of deception any less injurious to public morality; and we think that if it can be shewn that the income-tax both enables those who are dishonest to avoid their share of the public burthens, and tends to make those dishonest who never were so before, an argument is provided to which every statesman ought to pay the greatest attention.

Probably Mr. Fawcett has already modified his opinion on this point; for, in an able and well-timed speech lately delivered at Edinburgh, in reply to Mr. Cobden and the Liverpool Financial Reform Association, we find he used this very argument against the income-tax.

In conclusion: Mr. Fawcett has written a most useful book, and we heartily recommend all who are generously inclined to present a copy of it to any mechanics' institution or village library in which they feel an interest, taking care first to read it themselves.

MEMOIR OF THE LATE REV. DR. LLOYD, OF CARMARTHEN.

WHEN those who have performed a dignified and useful part on the stage of human life are finally removed from it, it is at once a natural and a laudable curiosity which leads us to inquire from what point they have started and under what influences they have acted. It is a fitting mode of doing honour to the virtuous dead, to retrace their lives, now closed, to recount their trials and their victories, the sacrifices which they have offered at the shrine of religion or humanity, and the success which has attended on their fidelity to high principles, that so their names may descend to posterity in conjunction with their characters and their services. Where these are worthy of admiration or gratitude, that admiration or gratitude should be freely and heartily conceded, as an act of allegiance to virtue herself.

And while the biographer thus performs an act of justice to the dead, he often renders a service of no small value to the living. For from whatever point the subject of his memoir has taken his start, and whatever the difficulties which he has overcome or the

temptations which he has resisted, there are always many others who may take courage or warning from his example, who may avoid some danger which he has incurred or some labyrinth of folly in which he has been entangled, or find some new encouragement to devote themselves without doubt or reserve to the service of high principles or the pursuit of honourable distinction.

It is true generally that the lives of literary men offer but little of varied or striking incident to give brilliancy or interest to their history. The poor scholar and the Dissenting minister have very many hopes and fears, faithful struggles and hard-won victories, which no pen but their own can record. Their humble sphere of duty, however faithful and devoted may have been their discharge of its obligations, brings them little, if at all, before the public eye, and contains but little of such greatness or heroism as the public mind can appreciate. Nor less truly may it be said that the teacher in a provincial Dissenting academy may, by faithfulness and diligence in the work of training candidates for the Christian ministry, have conferred many and inestimable advantages on thousands of his species, which hardly admit of accurate description, and which take no rank among the deeds on which the world usually bestows its applause.

Such was the position of the subject of the following brief sketch. He commenced life with a fixed determination to acquire such learning as might adapt him for usefulness as a Christian minister, and the amount of his success was equally honourable to his talents and his perseverance. And yet the retrospect of his life has few prominent points to give any special attraction to his biography.

DAVID LLOYD was born in 1805 at Llandyssul, a village in the county of Cardigan. His uncle, Dr. Charles Lloyd, says of his family that it was "one of the best and most ancient in the province that gave him birth, though in his time reduced by generosity, improvidence and extravagance," almost to poverty; and he in his later days used to point to the broad fields around Alltyrodin, near Llandyssul, and say that they once belonged to his ancestors, who "were great people in their day." But however great they may have been, he inherited nothing of their rank or riches. His father kept a school for many years in his native village, but all that he had inherited and all that he earned was expended so completely on his own personal indulgence, that his son was denied almost the necessities of life. Far removed thus from all the great thoroughfares of human activity, secluded from the great world of commerce and learning, shut out from all the chief means of civilization, it might have seemed to a less ambitious and enterprising nature that the very accident of his birthplace had precluded the possibility of his rising above the rank of an obscure Welsh peasant. But the case was widely different. He was soon enabled to look beyond his native hills,

and even to take rank among the competitors for university honours.

He commenced his education in his father's school at Llandysul, but made little progress there, and retained no agreeable recollections of either the kindness or the diligence of its conductor. When he was about ten years old, his uncle, Dr. Chas. Lloyd, took him with him to London, where he remained about twelve months, and whence he returned to his native village much improved both in character and education. He then entered the school of the Rev. John Thomas, for many years Unitarian minister at Pantydefaid, who always spoke in the highest terms of his pupil's general conduct and application to his studies; and here he remained till he had qualified himself for entering the College at Carmarthen.

From the very commencement of his career he shewed the same great outlines of character by which he was distinguished to the last. His plans and opinions were quickly though not rashly formed, and, once fixed, were pursued and maintained respectively with a firmness and pertinacity that could hardly be shaken. From the impression which these features of character made on the acquaintances of his youth, have proceeded the traditions that when only thirteen years old he opened a school, in which, by the instruction of the less favoured young inhabitants of Llandysul, he realized the few pence which he wanted for the accomplishment of some favourite object of his own; and that to purchase his first Latin Grammar, he walked to Carmarthen, a distance of sixteen miles, bearing back his literary treasure in joyous triumph, in the little pocket which had several hours ago contained his very slender viaticum.

From the first, the great object of young Lloyd's ambition was to be a Unitarian minister. His grandfather, whose name he bore, had been the first Unitarian minister in Wales. His uncle, the Rev. Richard Lloyd, had succeeded that grandfather at Llwynrhydowen; and his other uncle, Dr. Charles Lloyd, to whom he was indebted for the first effective step in his education, and his first introduction to that great world that lay beyond the limits of the county of Cardigan, exercised the same profession. With especial pleasure he listened to the praises of David Lloyd, of Llwynrhydowen, and resolved that some day such praises should be his own.

Full of this purpose, he entered on his college course at Carmarthen. While still a junior student there, he attracted the attention of the Rev. D. Davison, who came to Carmarthen as one of the deputation from the Presbyterian Board. Mr. Davison, in the course of the examination which he conducted, did not fail to discover the promising qualities of the young student. His judicious encouragement tended strongly to develop the powers whose existence he had discovered. As the diligent stu-

dent ripened into the successful professor, he never failed to acknowledge, with unabated esteem and affection, that Mr. Davison was the only patron he ever had; nor could the snows of age, as the venerable Principal sunk under the growing weight of years and disease, cool the grateful affection with which he recalled the memory of the Rev. David Davison.

Our young student's college days at Carmarthen were distinguished by nothing beyond the usual quiet routine of varying study, with the exception perhaps of the fixedness of his theological opinions, the intenseness of his conviction of their absolute truth, and the energy with which he asserted and defended them on all possible occasions. Of this, as of every succeeding period of his life, it may be said, in the words of one of his favourite students (B. T. Williams, Esq.),—"With Dr. Lloyd every aim in life was subject to his devotion to the doctrines of Unitarianism. He belonged to the old school, was an ardent admirer of Dr. Priestley, and a sincere believer in those views of theology and metaphysics of which he was the distinguished advocate. His enthusiasm on those questions knew no bounds. Impatient of contradiction and argument, he dealt with points of speculative reason as if they were capable of mathematical demonstration to all men who were possessed of honesty and sense."

After four years spent at Carmarthen with great diligence and success in his several classes, D. Lloyd entered the University of Glasgow as a Dr. Williams' scholar. The character which he maintained in this new scene of diligent labour and honourable aspiration is here described in the words of a cherished friend of his youth and of his old age, to whom he was united by the closest bonds of sympathy and affection at the University, and who mingled his tears with his, in a parting which both knew to be final, a few months before his death.

"You have asked me," says the Rev. C. Wicksteed, "to send you some recollections of our late mutual friend Dr. Lloyd, and I most gladly comply with your request, for there is no more natural or congenial, no more sacred or improving employment of one's thoughts and time, when one has lost a dear and valued friend, than that which induces one to review, in the hallowing light of memory and the interpreting light of years, that exchange of thought and that intercourse of the heart which have entered into the fabric of one's being, and have been among the influences and incidents which have made one what one is.

"I made the acquaintance of Dr. Lloyd first, when we were both students at the University of Glasgow, and both of us as exhibitioners of Dr. Williams' Trust. Although younger than he, yet having entered the University a year earlier, I was always a class in advance of him. Our previous education, too, was unequal. I, on the one hand, had had the advantage of a long-continued thorough classical drill at one of the large public

schools of England and under one of the foremost of English scholars. But here I stopped. Our friend, on the other hand, had gone through the whole course of instruction in Greek, Latin, Hebrew, Philosophy and Theology, at the Academy at Carmarthen. The result of these circumstances was, that though fellow-students in the same University, going through the same curriculum, designed for the same profession, and bound together by the most intimate and affectionate friendship, we were never brought into any direct rivalry or competition with each other; and that, as far as the special studies and forms of study of the University were concerned, my classes were a year in advance of his; while as far as the subjects themselves, and a previous knowledge of them under other auspices were concerned, he was always personally in advance of me. Thus all our conversations had a wider scope and a fuller tone than could have characterized them had we been strictly coevals and class fellows. Many of the topics and subjects that interested him, on which he had quite made up his mind, and on which he delighted to talk long and earnestly, were quite new to me from his point of view. He was a thorough and uncompromising Necessarian, a thorough and uncompromising Materialist, and a thorough and uncompromising Humanitarian. Priestley was his theologian; perhaps Priestley, Locke and Hartley, his philosophers; and Belsham his perfection of Pauline interpretation. The age of doubt, even of inquiry, seemed to have passed for him. He scarcely knew what doubt meant. The whole scheme of the Divine government and providence was as clear, as open, as unmistakeable to him, as the way to the class-room. At any hesitations or difficulties on my part he would sometimes almost storm with wonder. His persuasion of the fatherly character and unbounded love of God was so besetting and so profound, that no trial in personal lot, and no difficulty in the history of man or the government of the world, ever for an instant shook his faith or caused him to pause. He seemed each night to lay himself like a child in the arms of his Heavenly Father, not in the ignorance and simplicity of a real child, but like a child-man, trusting, persuaded, utterly convinced. Each morning he awoke with the same faith, which he had not even to put on with his clothes, but which awoke with him, rose with him, walked and talked and lived through the whole day with him. And what he did for himself, he did for the whole world. He laid his race, the angels, the universe, in the same way, whatever was happening or might happen, quietly and undoubtingly under the same absolutely wise and unerring, the same infinitely merciful and benignant care.

“He had a profound reverence for all classical attainments, partly perhaps from this part of his training not having been carried out very thoroughly, and he devoted himself with untir-

ing diligence to completing his studies in the languages of Greece and Rome. In this he succeeded so well, as, when taking his degree of Master of Arts, not merely to pass, but to take it with honourable distinction. The three great qualities which I should say our valued friend brought up with him to college and continued to evince to the end, were honesty of thought, purity of life and kindness of heart. To these he added a wonderful simplicity and frankness, amounting almost to self-exposure. Any weaknesses he had he wore upon his sleeve. Everybody knew them and saw them. A warm disputant, a sometimes angry polemic, he would close the strongest denunciation of the moral and religious tendency of the opinions held by his opponent with the merriest and kindest of laughs, and wishes of undoubted sincerity which ran over with personal goodwill. Unable to understand other states of conviction than his own, and other mental and spiritual requirements than his own, he was disposed to regard a statement, by whomsoever made, which he did not understand, as in itself unintelligible. He thus often appeared uncandid when he was only unimaginative, and unjust to his opponent when he was in truth utterly unconscious of his position."

This character of the student, drawn by the kind and discriminating hand of the friend who knew him most intimately, belonged equally to the professor and the polemic to the end of his life. His philosophy, whether of theology or metaphysics, remained unchanged; and the almost violence of his antipathy to opposing opinions still demanded the softening influence of his well-known generosity and kindness of disposition to shield it from the severest criticism. Many illustrations might be given of this peculiarity of character, but none perhaps more complete than his criticism of Mr. Martineau's "*Endeavours after the Christian Life*," at a later period. It was impossible that, with the style and habits of thought by which Dr. Lloyd was characterized, he should not find much in these sermons with which he could have no sympathy. Accustomed to think clearly, and to give simple and definite expression to his thoughts, he might well be vexed by the difficulty of doing so with those of Mr. Martineau. There are probably very few to whom the style of the "*Endeavours*" is not very perplexing. The transcendental style of the philosophy, the frequently paradoxical turn of the antithesis, and the perfect wilderness of fancy amidst which all definite vision is lost to the ordinary reader, might well puzzle or irritate a cooler critic than the reviewer with whom we have now to do. But still he was not justified in questioning the intelligibility of what he did not understand, or the possibility of a philosophy being genuine which did not harmonize with his own. He blamed the subject of his criticism not without reason, and from the stores of his own religious philosophy he drew much

that was equally true and excellent; but his criticism, even when just, and his argument, even when most luminous and cogent in itself, lost much of its force by the offensiveness of its style. The garb in which the truth was set forth caused her to be "evil spoken of," and unsuccessful in attaining the end at which she aimed.

Soon after leaving the University where he had so honourably distinguished himself, he was appointed by the Presbyterian Board to a professorship in the College at Carmarthen—an office the duties of which he fulfilled for thirty years with great ability, diligence and success. A Welshman of the Welsh, to use a Hebrew idiom, his affections radiated as from a centre, from his native village of Llandyssul, over the Principality, its language and its people. The large number of Welsh students especially whose studies he superintended, and many of whom, coming from the humblest class of society, stood much in need of varied aid and direction, received from him not so much the formal training of the professor as the tender and assiduous care of a father. No special incident seems to have marked the period of his professorship in its diligent and generous course till 1852, when an old and favourite pupil, from whose pen a faithful and picturesque description of his old tutor has met the public eye, was commissioned by the Senate of the University of Glasgow to convey to him his diploma as Doctor of Laws. About the same time he received a handsome legacy from a distant relative, which, with a prudent regard to the future and a less impetuous temperament, would have added largely and permanently to the comfort and independence of himself and others. To him, however, a few thousand pounds seemed to be a gold mine of inexhaustible supply, and called into exercise an extravagant generosity which rendered this gift of fortune comparatively valueless; and the clouds of life's evening, on which it ought to have shed some light, and the anxieties of the declining husband and father, which it ought to have alleviated, were left by it almost unaffected. In 1853, he married a lady from whom it was not unreasonable that he should look for a great accession to his happiness. And whatever the most devoted affection could do to sustain him under growing infirmity and to alleviate the anguish of mortal disease, she did for several years. From his childhood, Dr. Lloyd had had a slight deformity of his right foot. So long as the vigour of youth remained, he appeared not to be conscious of it, or to sustain any inconvenience from it; but when he had passed the meridian of life's day, his lameness rapidly increased, and such symptoms of constitutional weakness set in as shewed but too plainly that the evening was not very far distant. The work of the class-room, however, was performed with the same regularity, and every scheme of benevolent effort pursued with unabated vigour. The education of the masses he had always

advocated with generous earnestness and promoted by vigorous action and liberal subscriptions, and had the satisfaction of seeing the Lancasterian schools, which had been built under his auspices, and the Literary and Philosophical Institution of which he had long been one of the Vice-presidents, performing successfully the good work for which they were destined. To the Infirmary of Carmarthen, however, his benevolent and self-sacrificing efforts were especially devoted. Several years before his death he had resolved to raise twenty pounds a-year for this institution chiefly by lecturing. And this purpose he accomplished up to the very year preceding his death, often bestowing upon it an amount of labour which was greatly disproportioned to his health. In all respects, indeed, his schemes of charity were too large for his means, but carried out with a pertinacity of purpose which brooked no control, intolerant of other people's wisdom in this as in his philosophy.

Dr. Lloyd's strong attachment to his religious views, and his earnest zeal in propagating them have been already mentioned. Of his character in his respect, he has left a chapel, with the inscription on its front, "To us there is but one God, the Father," to testify. It was built under his own superintendence from funds raised by him chiefly among his English friends.

About two years ago he was attacked by the disease under which he finally sunk. He was at once informed that it must prove fatal. The tidings shook but did not prostrate him. And till within a few weeks of his death he pursued all his old plans of usefulness, sustained by his trust in that Providence, the wisdom and benevolence of which he had in his early life so firmly and impetuously maintained. The theology which recommended itself to his youth, and which was cherished by him through life, sustained him amidst his decline.

That infirmities attached to the character and life of which this very imperfect sketch has been given, will not be denied. It had not otherwise been human. Nor have these been kept out of view. But when he went to the narrow house of final rest, a long funeral procession declared significantly enough the general judgment of his fellow-citizens, that a good and useful man had been taken away from among them.

STATUTORY FAITH.

If experience has taught us anything, it is the absurdity of controlling men's notions of eternity by Acts of Parliament.—SYDNEY SMITH.

ARCHBISHOP WHATELY.

THREE years and a few months have seen all the four Archbishoprics of England and Ireland vacant through death; and that of York a second time through translation. Of the four departed prelates, Whately is the only one who has left a strong intellectual or administrative mark upon his time. It may be no blame to the quiet Musgrave and the gentle-hearted Sumner that they did the mere work for which they were evidently appointed in keeping English Church politics and doctrines quiet; and the Irish Church Establishment was proud of her princely Beresford's munificence alike in her tithe struggles and the national struggle against famine;—but Whately had a more distinctive work, as he had a more distinctive personal ability; and his episcopal life has amply justified the wisdom of the appointment which in 1831 startled the English Church and alarmed the Irish. It was a bold step on the part of Earl Grey to appoint as successor to a Churchman so conspicuously orthodox and intolerant as Archbishop Magee, one not yet consecrated, nor even in high preferment, whose life had been almost exclusively spent as Fellow of a College and Principal of a Hall at Oxford, and who was notorious and singular there for his liberalism in theology, politics and literature, and for the boldness, bordering upon aggressiveness, and not a little tinged with eccentricity, with which he spoke his thoughts, in all companies and on all occasions.

Earl Grey knew his man, as he knew the work awaiting him. Catholic emancipation had just been carried; the Irish Church temporalities had to be adjusted by the secular power, and the great experiment of a truly national education irrespective of religious differences was to be fairly tried in Ireland. This last was the special work for the equitable administration of which the new Archbishop was required to labour and watch.

The Irish system of education, as then instituted (for it has been varied since, perhaps not for the better), approached nearer to a truly *national* education than anything since attempted in England. Seemingly, for the very reason that popular education in Ireland was a thing almost unknown, the Government found freer scope, in spite even of the Catholic and Protestant feuds, than in England, where religious sects had already laid hold of education as a means of disseminating their creeds. Difficult as the problem seemed of bringing the Catholic and Protestant population under a system of combined education, it was effected. The Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, the aged and amiable Dr. Murray, was as honest and earnest in the work as his Protestant compeer; and so, while the former lived, the system had fair play, and was accepted on all hands as a blessing to the land. But when Dr. Murray was succeeded by Dr. Cullen, the waters

of life were not long untroubled. There can be no doubt that the intensely Papal bigotry of the latter was the means of suggesting to the minds of Catholics objections against some of the books compiled or sanctioned by the Commissioners of Schools. Chief among these was one written by Whately, which had not only been approved by Dr. Murray, but had been examined and sanctioned by the Pope of that time. These books seem to have been at first furtively suppressed through Catholic influence in some of the normal schools; and Dr. Whately, on discovering the fact, rightly complained and protested. But he took somewhat extreme ground in maintaining that a book once approved by the Commissioners could never be suppressed even by them; and when the Board after long deliberation determined to remove the books in question from the hour of collective to that of special school teaching, he withdrew, in company with Baron Greene and Mr. Blackburne. This was in 1852.

It seems curious and not very significant of the liberality of Irish Protestants, that the Archbishop was deemed a better Churchman from the moment when he retired from this conflict against Papal bigotry. The fact is that he gave his leisure and influence thenceforward more to the organizations of Protestant Church activity. His clergy thought him more evangelical for seeming to take a personal interest in their little proselytisms, which had the patronage of Mrs. Whately and her daughters, than when they saw him holding the scales of justice and the seal of truth at the Education Board. Having felt it necessary to leave his special work as the educational Archbishop of Dublin, no wonder that a man of his energy, even at sixty-six years of age, should look round to see what next best thing he might promote; and he found it in the commoner activities of clerical life. But it is idle to pretend that any change had taken place in Dr. Whately's character or opinions. He shewed himself still sore on the subject of the Educational Board, and distrustful of its workings, when, in 1859, he published his annotated edition of Paley's *Moral Philosophy*, quoting a passage from "an educational book which, it may fairly be said, is circulated throughout England at the *public expense*, being used in Roman Catholic schools receiving Government grants under what is called the 'separate system,' the system which some are desirous to introduce into Ireland also." The passage quoted relates to Queen Mary's treatment of "Cranmer and a great many Protestant bishops," who were "put in prison and burnt for heresy." It lays down, for children's religious instruction, the principle, that "when men are determined to destroy not only their own souls but the souls of many others, they have to be treated as malefactors, and are given over by the Church to the law to be punished." And it concludes: "It was very shocking that people should be burned; but it was much more shocking that they

should be leading so many more people to be burned in the flames of hell for ever; and this was what Bishop Gardiner thought." (Paley's *Mor. Phil.*, p. 51.)

The external events of Archbishop Whately's life are briefly these: Born in London, 1787 (his father being a Prebendary of Bristol), he was educated at Oxford, graduating B.A. in 1808, became Fellow of Oriel in 1811, Coplestone being master of that college, and Arnold, Hampden, Keble and J. Blanco White, all connected with it. In 1821, he resigned his Fellowship for the living of Halesworth, Suffolk; but in 1825 he returned to Oxford as Principal of St. Alban Hall, and took the degrees of B.D. and D.D. His appointment to the Archbishopric six years after, called forth all kinds of accusations against his supposed latitudinarianism, indifferentism, Socinianism, &c.; and his friend Arnold wrote thus in his defence:

"In point of essential holiness there does not live a truer Christian than Whately. It grieves me that he is spoken of as dangerous and latitudinarian, because his intellectual nature keeps pace with his spiritual, instead of being left as Low Churchmen leave it—a fallow field for all unsightly creeds to flourish in. He is a truly great man, in the truest sense of the word; and if the safety and welfare of the Protestant Church in Ireland depend on human instruments, none could be found in the whole empire so likely to maintain it."

If Whately, like Arnold himself, had to *fallow it* a little at last, according to approved Church rotation, we must divide the blame, the pity and the sorrow, between the men and the system.

Whately's mind was essentially logical and critical; clear, penetrating, powerful and unceasingly active. But some of his critics now find that he had not much "breadth of intellect," and "seemed scarcely capable of grasping at once the general bearing and the individual details of a subject and thus becoming completely its master." The *Guardian* says of him:

"His warm admirers maintain that if he had never been an Archbishop, his reputation would have been greater still. We cannot assent to their conclusion. For wide renown, if it had been attainable at all by the Principal of St. Alban Hall, must have depended almost entirely on literary triumphs. But there is no indication in Whately's writings of his ability to have produced any really great or permanent work. Other treatises he might have written as clever and as clear as those which now bear his name; but of all the eminent men with whom he was contemporary at Oxford, not one perhaps shewed himself less capable of sounding the depths of a great argument than the future Archbishop of Dublin. Admirable in his exposure of a sophism, keen and unsparing in his triumph over an exploded prejudice, he seldom went deeper than the immediate necessities of his enterprise obliged him to search. The remarkable perspicuity of nearly all that he wrote was due in part to the limited range of his vision: he stated things clearly, not only because his power of statement was great, but still more because he would not, or could not, see more than was quite consistent with

what he had to say. Such an intellect might indeed have achieved its triumphs, if it had been enlisted in the defence of a great cause; but its energy was naturally destructive rather than creative. It was said of him, in playful allusion to the titles of some of his numerous essays, that he was made up of *Doubts, Difficulties, Peculiarities* and *Errors*; and it is no exaggeration to affirm that these principally engaged his attention: his literary efforts were almost always of an iconoclastic kind. He does not appear to have read extensively on any subject, preferring perhaps to think questions out for himself, with whatever disadvantage to his endeavour from ignorance of the mistakes or discoveries of thinkers that had gone before."

We do not think the essential qualities of his mind are here truly described. If he was fairly subject to these comments, they fall upon his ecclesiastical position rather than upon his mental characteristics. To whatever degree Whately became a special pleader, it was *as a Churchman* that he became so. And as his Churchmanship could not suppress more than a small part of his manliness, the Church organ above quoted further says of him, that "the true requirements of the episcopal office, and the real nature of the Church as a divine institution, were among the subjects which to the last he can hardly be said to have understood." And it makes use of his later days of alienation from the Board of Education to lower him intellectually, if not morally, thus:

"At all events, his words and actions during the last years of his life savoured less of philosophy, and more of religious partizanship, than they ever had before. It may be that the necessity of resigning the seat he had held for twenty years at the Board of Education brought with it a sense of the vanity of the hopes he had once cherished. Or, he may have been led to feel that mere liberalism, however agreeable to the intellectual activity of early years, is not after all a cause worth living and dying for; it is too much of a negation to satisfy the best affections of a great soul. Be this as it may, we have known Archbishop Whately of late years as a somewhat earnest Protestant, apparently more anxious about scriptural truth, and more disposed to make converts to his own way of thinking, than those who knew him thirty years ago would ever have thought to be possible. The latter phase of his life was beyond doubt that which was most consonant to the feeling of the people among whom his lot was cast, and the most likely to secure him a grateful remembrance in Irish Protestant hearts."

It is curious to notice how the various memoirs of the Archbishop, almost with one consent, omit all allusion to his interesting connection with Blanco White. On going to Dublin he took White as tutor to his son, already known by *Doblado's Letters from Spain*, and whose intercourse at Oxford had resulted in many ties of sympathy, political and general, rather than distinctly theological. When Blanco White, a few years afterwards, found himself in religious antagonism to the Established Church of this country, he insisted, in opposition to the wishes of his

friend, upon withdrawing from his hospitable roof; and the exile's scruples, and the Archbishop's understood resistance to them, were alike honourable to the two. Blanco White persisted and removed to Liverpool.

The writings of Archbishop Whately were, it is to be regretted, chiefly of an occasional, local or supplementary character. He has left no great substantial work, worthy of his ability, by which he will live as a writer; though everything he did was well worth doing, and usually well done. His first authorship was at Halesworth, where he published some essays and sermons, and also (anonymously) his famous "Historic Doubts respecting Napoleon Bonaparte," a masterpiece of *ad absurdum* criticism on the mythical expounders of the Christian history. His Elements of Logic and of Rhetoric were composed at Oxford, while he was Principal of St. Alban, and published at first in the *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*, afterwards as separate volumes. For one year before his elevation to the episcopal bench, he was Professor of Political Economy in Oxford; and among his works are "Lectures on Political Economy, with Remarks on Tithes, Poor Laws and Penal Colonies."

His other principal works are :

Bacon's Essays, with Annotations.

Two Essays on the Kingdom of Christ.

Essays on the Writings of Paul.

Essays on some Peculiarities of the Christian Religion.

Essays on the Errors of Romanism having their Origin in Human Nature.

Essays on Dangers to Christian Faith from the Teaching and Conduct of its Professors.

Charges and other Tracts.

Sermons on various Subjects.

Among occasional minor pamphlets we find :

The Scripture Doctrine of the Sacrament.

Explanations of the Bible and Prayer-Book.

Lectures on some of the Parables.

Lectures on the Apostles.

Lectures on Good and Evil Angels.

Scripture Revelations respecting a Future Life.

Statements and Reflections on the Hampden Question (1848).

And among elementary books for the young there are :

Lessons on Christian Evidences (14th edition).

Lessons on History of Religious Worship.

Lessons on Reasoning.

Lessons on Mind.

Lessons on Money Matters (14th edition).

Lessons on Morals.

Lessons on the British Constitution.

His latest work in authorship, we believe, was to re-edit, with annotations, in 1859, Paley's Evidences and the first part of his Moral Philosophy. His critical examination of the former found little to alter or expunge, and of the latter so little to retain that he did not re-edit the second portion.

GENTILE BLOOD IN JESUS CHRIST.

SIR,

THE apostle Paul's holy remonstrance against another gospel surely is not much heeded. In addition to the four usually denominated "canonical," we have had (not to cite others) a Life of Jesus by a rational German evangelist named Strauss; and his critical pseudevangel has hardly had its day out, when France captivates Christendom and sceptendom alike with the Gospel according to Renan.

Admirable as may be the knowledge and eloquence of this courteous Hebraistic rhetorician, he well-nigh baffles comment by the *creative* faculty which the public appear so confidently to allow him to exercise in the materials of history. Surely it were not uncharitable or unwarrantable liberty of language to designate such theorizing records as those of Renan, sheer theological *Rappism*, of which M. Renan is the learned, polite and fearless "medium."

Unbounded boldness of assertion and assumption in authors and speakers—sceptical credulity (if we may so express mingled doubt of old truths and trust in new faiths) on the part of readers and hearers—hunger after the grossly incredible, coming close upon an ejection of long-cherished, ill-digested creeds—such seem some of the characteristics of an age which is cordial and fervid towards modern rhetoric, lukewarm, if not cold, towards a religion as ancient as Abraham and Adam in its principles, its origin and (to use a pet word of our time quite emphatically) its development.

You will perhaps, Mr. Editor, deem this a strange preamble to a plea in favour of one point in the suggestive theories of Renan.

Discerning in the temperate review of this author within your pages, I think, the accomplished and very discreet pen of a much-valued fellow-student, I almost dread to differ with *him* and agree on a genealogical point with Renan.

On p. 579 of your October No., is a paragraph from which I omit the comment on the name "Jesus," as irrelevant to my present subject. But how M. Renan or any one else can deny lineage to Jesus of Nazareth from and through David, and yet find or feign grounds for admixture of Gentile blood, I cannot imagine. Nor probably can you, Mr. Editor, avoid wondering what grounds I am about to take.

With the author of the new "Life of Jesus" it may be (as your able reviewer imputes) "merest conjecture" "that his parentage may have been mixed with Gentile blood." With myself, I plead it is not so; while I make confession that I concur here with the French sceptic, and humbly allege scriptural proof that the Christ was *not* of thoroughly pure Jewish or Israelitish blood. The sentences in your review are,

"The birth at Bethlehem is discredited as an after legend; and not only so, but (wilfully and needlessly as seems to us) Joseph's descent from David is flatly denied, and its invention at a later period is hinted to have been a Messianic necessity." And, "It is even hinted (as merest conjecture) that his parentage may have *been mixed with Gentile blood.*"

Now, Mr. Editor, I desire neither to roundly assert nor acutely speculate on any such matter. For some years past I have entertained a conviction of the (so to say) *heterogeneity* of Jesus Christ, not based upon mystical nor metaphysical notions as to divine procreation, but growing out of an almost accidental acquaintance on my own part with an explicit passage in the Old Testament. Believing in the genealogical descent of Jesus Christ from David, I yet also believe that mixed Israelitish and Gentile blood flowed in the veins of *them both*. My grounds for this opinion are obvious in the genealogical summary at the end of the book of Ruth (iv. 9—22). Doubtless, if "Ruth" is to be politely put aside as mythical, fabulous, or pure romance, my position becomes the baseless fabric of a vision. But if Ruth is retained and read as real history, how episodical and epic soever it may be, then *Moabitish* blood, blended with Israelitish, flowed through the veins of Jesse and of David; and so on through direct course of consanguinity into Jesus, son of Joseph and Mary, the Son of God.

Counter arguments, genealogical, theological, philological or ethnological, will have due weight with me, if they be fully and fairly adduced. But unless and until they be so, I, with a layman's look upon the text and the testimony (Ruth iv.—*end*), beg leave to differ on this point with my clerical friends; and concur (not, however, "on merest conjecture") with the sceptical French Hebraist in "an idea," that thoroughly *Gentile* (v. g. *Moabitish*) blood was mingled in the parentage of Jesus Christ.

October 7, 1863.

S. C. FREEMAN.

[The Gentile admixture in the genealogy of David (as descended from Ruth the Moabitess)—and thereby of Jesus Christ also if descended from David—is of course admitted on all hands. The question to which M. Renan's theory is subjected by our reviewer is: What proof can he adduce of *later* Gentile or half-Gentile origin for Jesus of Nazareth, in place of his disputed descent from David? Mr. Freeman appears to have missed the question as connected with Renan's suggestion; the purpose of which plainly is to account for the universality of our Lord's mind by doubting his Jewish lineage,—while, however, he at the same time denies him any sort of acquaintance with the Gentile world and its civilization.—ED. C. R.]

AGUR'S PRAYER.

A MONTHLY reviewer said that Agur's prayer "could be conceived only in a mind concentered in self, frigid, timid and narrow, content with safety, and aspiring neither to virtuous happiness nor honour;" and that "Give me riches" is a good prayer in the mouth of a good man! On this, Southey remarks: "Yes, when the Lord's Prayer has been repealed, and we shall be told that it is no longer necessary for us to pray, lead us not into temptation."—*Southey's Commonplace-book*.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Lectures on the Pentateuch. By the Rev. John Gow, B.A., delivered in the Bays-Hill Chapel, Cheltenham. Pp. 75.

THIS little work makes its appearance at a very seasonable moment, in connection with the recent discussions on Bishop Colenso and the Pentateuch. Within the space of eleven short Lectures, it contains much interesting matter in a popular form; and it will materially help the intelligent reader either to clear away or to allow their just value to various doubts and difficulties which cannot fail to have been awakened, or raised into new importance, by those discussions. In particular, it well shews us in many instances how, while we look upon the Pentateuch as a valuable repository of religious truths, there is yet no reason and no claim upon us to accept all its statements as exactly true; for that a human element of imperfect knowledge, in matters of both science and history, is largely and constantly intermingled with just moral and religious feeling.

The spirit in which this apparently leading design of the work is executed will appear from the following sentences, which form the commencement of the first lecture. Starting from Paul's expression, 2 Cor. iv. 7, "We have this treasure in earthen vessels," Mr. Gow observes:

"I wish to apply these words of the apostle to the whole subject of my lectures. The books which I shall bring before your notice, contain, as do all the books of our Holy Scriptures, a priceless treasure. They contain revealings of eternal truth. But that treasure has come down to us in earthen vessels. The eternal truth is surrounded with changing human opinions, is transmitted to us in an outward form, and in human language, which require to be examined and understood. It is the voice of common sense and genuine piety which bids us separate the human from the divine; to distinguish clearly what comes from Him with whom there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning, from that which belongs to the peculiar notions of past generations. The first five books of our Bible, which are commonly called 'the Pentateuch,' possess a vast religious value for all who will try to understand them. They treat of subjects which have a permanent human interest. They treat of the origin of creation; of the first appearance of our race upon the earth, and of their early history. They record personal narratives which mark a state of society far removed from our own, but at the same time exhibit human aspirations, and thoughts, and actions, so much akin to those that make up our daily experience, that we feel ourselves in close spiritual connection with men of far distant ages. These books treat of the rise and early progress of a people who have exercised a greater influence over the world—and especially over us—than any other nation.

"It is, therefore, well worth your while to study these venerable memorials of primæval history. You will find an extensive human element in them: notions about God and about man, which, viewed in the light of the Sun of Righteousness, seem to us dark and erroneous; but you will see rays of heavenly light shining down upon the darkness, constant evidence of the presence of the Spirit of God with the first patriarchs of our race. You will find earthen vessels filled with a divine treasure."—Pp. 1, 2.

Pursuing his design, Mr. Gow goes on to speak of the authorship of the Pentateuch, and gives reasons for believing that the work is not to be ascribed to Moses, or to his time. Of course, in so limited a space as the lecture occupies, this can be done only in the most cursory and incomplete manner. The author's statements on this part of his subject

are wholly negative; that is, against the Mosaic authorship. We think the Lectures deficient, in taking no notice of the replies which may be made to much of this negative evidence. It does not give a fair impression of the state of the case to put forward only one side of it, as though nothing were to be said on the other; as though the negative critics had all the evidence and sound reasoning on their side, and their opponents none whatever. But Mr. Gow, we are sure, does not intend to be so partial an advocate. He, doubtless, intends us rather to accept his statements as simply conveying the result which the consideration of the whole case has left upon his own mind, and indeed says as much in one passage. But even hence we have statements which will appear to many readers too positive, and perhaps untrue, when regard is paid to the evidence by which they are here supported. Thus we are told, "We know as an historical fact that the name Jehovah was totally unknown before the time of Moses" (p. 4). Again, in reference to the first and second chapters of Genesis, we are told, "No ingenuity can combine these two chapters into one narrative. They are given in our Bible as two, and whoever gave us them both, never dreamed that we should take either as a literal narrative of facts" (p. 5). In both cases, the propositions made are at least open to very considerable doubt.

In regard to the name Jehovah, it was pointed out by Ewald, long before Bishop Colenso was heard of, that that name did not come into prominence, or into popular use, until the time of Moses. His reasons for this statement are ingenious. No proper name remains to us, in the Hebrew books, in which the syllable *Jah*, or *Jeho*, is an element, from a date earlier than Moses, whose mother (Jochebed) and successor (Joshua) are the first persons to present this name thus used in composition (the name *Joshua* being conferred by Moses himself, Numb. xiii. 16). On the other hand, we have many names, from the period preceding Moses, in which the syllable *El*, and even perhaps the word *Shaddai*, are found. Ewald concludes that the name Jehovah may have been in use in the family of the mother of Moses as their special name of God, but that its peculiar signification and use were given to it by the legislator of the Hebrews, on assuming his office. It is evident how conjectural all this is. It is, however, to our minds, much preferable to the view of Bishop Colenso, who contends that the name Jehovah "did not come into use for a long period after the Mosaic times."

On the other question above referred to, we may be very certain that the compiler of Genesis, who put the statements of the first two chapters in such close proximity, must have looked upon them as forming one harmonious narrative; and had no idea that the nice critical discernment of later times would be so perfectly sure, as it says it is, that the chapters are utterly inconsistent with one another. In truth, does not the second chapter simply supply the details which serve in part to fill up the more general outline of the first? Thus, for example, in i. 27, we are told, "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." In ii. 7, 18, 21, we have only a repetition of this statement, with particulars of the *modus operandi*, but no positive contradiction; only a filling up of the outline previously given. So it is in other cases; and thus, although the chapters may be derived from separate original documents, and although there is repetition, with an apparent beginning over again (at ii. 4), and

great awkwardness of expression, almost amounting to inconsistency of statement, yet it is surely going too far to say that "no ingenuity can combine these two chapters into one narrative." All the appearances are very much what might be expected, considering the early age from which the writing comes down to us, considering the inflexible character of the original language, and considering the want of skill in literary composition, or compilation, which must be supposed to have been natural to any writer of so remote a time.

It is, as we have already noticed, a part of the plan of these Lectures to point out the religious truths which are often suggested to a reader in various sections of the Mosaic books, and which constitutes what we may term the permanent religious value of the books. In doing this, there is a marked disposition on the author's part to represent the narrative as figurative or as allegorical, and not originally intended to be taken in any literal historical sense. Thus, while we are told that the account of the creation in the first chapter of Genesis is a cosmogony, which no other cosmogony written since approaches "in sublimity of language or truthfulness of thought" (p. 15), we are also informed that the narrative of the fall is a very different kind of composition.

"The second chapter [third?] of Genesis gives us in an allegory what the writer conceived to be the true relation between a perfect God and his perfect work, Man."—P. 16.

This statement is followed out in detail; but we must say we greatly doubt its correctness. It is a very ancient way of meeting the difficulties of the history in the Pentateuch, to represent it as largely allegorical. But is there any more reason for so considering the second or third chapter, than there is for so considering the first? The author of Genesis does not inform us that he is writing allegorically. The expression of mystical ideas or supposed religious truths, under the form of allegory, does not belong to a primitive age, nor prevail among those who are unpractised in literary composition. They are accustomed rather to express in writing (or, it may be, in painting), and in the most simple, literal way, what they believe to exist or to have occurred. Most probably, therefore, the writer of Genesis embodied in these narratives the belief of his people and of himself as to the creation and the first transgression of man. He would do so in the plain narrative form in which the account now lies before us, because that form expresses just what was believed. A later age might allegorize his statements, as was done so largely by Clement of Alexandria and others of the same school. But we imagine it is better to take these ancient records for what they so obviously are, than to subject them to such arbitrary methods of interpretation. Nor do we see how by taking it "as a narrative of facts," . . . "we are involved in insuperable difficulties and contradictions," as Mr. Gow alleges, or how we lose any "spiritual truth" which the sacred author really intended to convey. So taking it, we look upon the narrative as simply embodying the belief of the ancient Hebrews as to the first transgression. "Difficulties and contradictions" lie at *their* door, not at ours; for it is indeed incumbent upon us, in reading these statements of their sacred books, to accept them as they are given to us, and not to put meanings upon them which were never intended—meanings, often of a refined and lofty character, altogether unsuited to the early age in which the writings doubtless had their origin.

While thus thinking, we must admit that Mr. Gow very often sets forth, in an able and interesting manner, the great moral and religious truths which may be supposed to be expressed by statements in themselves largely "unhistorical." We may, indeed, very well doubt whether the statements were originally composed from the author's conscious intention to express such truths, as his primary object. It may not the less appear, however, that his mind was filled and swayed with a genuine sense of the divine moral government, and of the duty of man to live a righteous life before God. And this, we hold, constitutes the true religious value of a large portion of the Pentateuch and of the Old Testament history in general. But statements of the historical kind were nevertheless most probably intended to be taken in their historical sense, not as allegories, nor as mere vehicles of any kind for setting forth the higher truth which we may see in them. The historical or traditional narrative is given for its own sake simply, and as such; its spiritual meaning or influence may often have been quite secondary in the writer's mind, or even, it is possible to conceive, not at all distinctly thought of by him. In this latter case, might we not even be justified in looking upon such half-conscious, or also unconscious, utterances of moral and religious truth as, in the language of the popular theology, the product of a divine inspiration?

We will, in conclusion, quote a passage by which it will be seen how well Mr. Gow can recommend historical narratives as the means of enforcing or illustrating important truths of the highest character. It is the opening portion of the sixth lecture.

"In my last lecture I stated what the religious significance of the narrative of the deluge was. Under the wonderful description of a desolating flood, is conveyed the belief that unrighteousness meets with its reward here; that God sends down his punishment upon the wicked. This belief is prominent throughout the Pentateuch, indeed throughout the Old Testament. And in the prominence of this belief we may find some explanation of the absence of any allusion to the existence of a future state in the Pentateuch. The doctrine of retribution beyond the grave is but darkly hinted at in any portion of the Jewish Scriptures. For some mysterious reason, the attention of the chosen people was fixed upon the displays of God's righteous judgments in this life. Hence all outward events, prosperous or disastrous, were regarded as effects of Divine favour or anger. God's great hatred of sin is set forth in many narratives of calamity which overtook those who violated the righteous laws of Jehovah. All misfortunes, national or individual, were looked upon as witnesses of the Divine displeasure against wickedness. But still the Creator is always represented as punishing men with reluctance, as unwilling that they should die, desirous that all should turn unto him and live. Judgment is His strange work, mercy is His delight. Therefore after the flood, the beautiful emblem of human hope and divine goodness appears in the sky. God said, 'And it shall come to pass, when I bring a cloud over the earth, that the bow shall be seen in the cloud. And I will remember my covenant which is between me and you and every living creature of all flesh.' What a precious spiritual truth is here conveyed to us! In the midst of judgment God remembers mercy. He brings a cloud occasionally over each one of us; darkness overshadows us; and the flood sweeps over us, and we are overwhelmed with dismay or prostrated with suffering; out of the deep we send up our piteous cry, and the Lord hears, and the darkness increases, and we behold the bow in the cloud, telling us of hope, and of mercy, and of a God who remembers his covenant, and gives us the oil of joy for mourning, and the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness."—Pp. 34, 35.

The Quarterly Review. No. 228. October, 1863.

UNLIKE its ancient rival, the *Edinburgh Review*, the current No. of the *Quarterly* is varied and happy in the choice of its subjects, and offers a succession of readable and interesting articles. The No. opens with an essay, well stored with facts, on the Progress of Engineering Science. A genial article follows on the Life and Writings of Thomas Hood, whose wit and humour were not more characteristic of the man than his strong moral sense and cheerful fortitude. Wonderful seems the incessant stream of his wit and humour when we realize to ourselves the trials and calamities through which the course of his life ran! In one respect, his fortune was better than has fallen to the lot of some men of genius. He had an admirable wife, whose talent was not inconsiderable, but whose good sense and moral worth were still better. Speaking of the early years of their married life, the reviewer says:

“Good fortune appeared to smile from out a bit of unclouded blue heaven above, and all that was wifely and womanly strove to make one spot of earth green and pleasant below. The love of a wife like this was a blessing indeed to the man who had to pass through such fires of affliction and waters of tribulation. Her devotion, willing at all times to transfuse her life into his, must have often heartened him for a fresh effort in the weary struggle. Many a time she must have inspired him to face the outer difficulties by helping to keep the spirit warm, and bright, and hopeful within. When the book shall be written which might be written, on the ‘Wives of Men of Genius,’ one of the noblest chapters should be given to Mrs. Hood.

“Hood had need of all the sunshine and sweetness that could be gathered from these years of happiness to hoard up a little honey in the hive of Home for the sad seasons coming!”—P. 340.

This is the reviewer’s portrait of Thomas Hood:

“‘A man of great heart and bright humours, my masters, and a sorrow that sits with its head under one wing.’ A mind of many features, with as continual changes of expression as the ripples of a breeze-tinted summer sea. A spirit of earnestness hard at work; a spirit of quaint pleasantries as assiduously at play. A gentle, genial nature, in which the most opposite elements were kindly mixed; many-sided, and curiously felicitous at most points. He somewhere speaks of the Nine Muses dwelling together in one house for the sake of cheapness. His was the one house, where but poor entertainment they got for the rare entertainment they gave. Wit never before assumed such numerous shapes, to spring so many sudden surprises,—more especially in the way it passes into pathos. His gayest laughter somehow touches the underlying melancholy of life, and leaves a sad chord thrilling long after the laughter has done ringing. In the midst of the mirth all is changed in the twinkling of an eye, and you are hood-winked into tears. The pungency of much of Hood’s humour is pathos. If we consider the state of health and the outward environment in which the wit flashed and humour flowed, it is inexpressibly touching, as the Fool’s labouring to out-jest the crying sorrows of poor old Lear. Some of his richest jewels of wit are his own tears set glittering in fictitious sunshine; the world preferred them thus pleasantly lighted up. And how splendidly they twinkled and shone when relieved by the sombre background of such a life!” P. 350.

In rebuke of those who dared in the narrowness of their souls to hint that Hood was irreligious, the reviewer well observes:

“Hood’s religion was of the practical kind, that stays one in life, and serves one in death. He was one of those who are so shy on the subject that they find it an insurmountable difficulty to get their feelings in this vital matter pub-

lished through the customary forms. His religion breathed through all his life, work-days as well as Sundays. It ascended like incense in his own household, sweetening the sick chamber, enriching the young life of his little ones, hallowing his love, and passing with the force of tenderest pity into his poetry. It enlarged his heart spiritually, until his charity could embrace those whom the world had cast out, and those for whom the sects were too narrow.

"Sydney Smith was a tolerant man, yet he confessed to one little weakness—a secret desire to roast a Quaker. Hood also was tolerant, but he too had his weakness; he would roast the Pharisees and the 'unco guid' in their own conceit. But he held sacred all that was high and holy. He was none the less religious because he hated cant and warred against it; because he had no sympathy with that Scottish clergyman who was horrified at seeing people walking the streets of Edinburgh on a Sunday, smiling and looking perfectly happy. There was no blasphemy, no unbelief, no *wanton* wile in the wit of Thomas Hood."—Pp. 348, 349.

There follows a cautious, in some respects a timid, article on the Antiquity of Man, suggested of course by Sir Charles Lyell's "Geological Evidences." A not unwise caution, becoming a scientific writer, is shewn in declining to accept some recent speculations as established conclusions of scientific truth. The timidity appears in that minute portion of the article which refers to the theological bearing of certain geological facts.

"Geology (says the reviewer), once or twice in a century, receives unseasonable thanks and incurs inconsiderate censure for the supposed help or impediments which it offers to Theology. The praise and the blame are alike unjust. Christian faith needs no such help, and fears no such opposition. Founded on moral evidence and the nature of man, it looks with calmness on questions of the limits of species, and the antiquity of unknown races of savages. When these questions have received surer solutions than we at present possess or have reason to expect, it will be time enough for considering in what relation they stand to things of higher value. If we should never resolve them, it will be no occasion for wonder, for nature is full of unanswered questions; but if we never try to resolve them, it should be a cause for regret. It is not so much by successful interpretation of the wonders of nature, as by diligent exertion of the faculties which God has given in the study of the works which He has created, that man vindicates his glorious destiny of never-ending advancement, and separates himself from the beasts that perish."—P. 415.

The remark is only just, if theologians choose to assert the claims of an unreasoning bibliolatry which would represent the Bible as not only a storehouse of scientific as well as moral truth, and would treat it as, to the last letter, absolutely infallible.

The next article treats on one of the subjects noticed already by us in our review of Mr. Fawcett's Political Economy, namely, Co-operative Societies. The reviewer is strongly in favour of them, and has collected many facts shewing their success both in this country and abroad. We may note that in his historical account of the Rochdale Pioneers, he differs from Mr. Fawcett in attributing to the founders of the society very extended views of what they were to do from the beginning. According to Mr. Fawcett, the results of their undertaking surprised even themselves. One may feel a little surprise that no reference whatever is made to Mr. Fawcett's volume.

The recent tidings from Japan give a painful interest to the next article, on that country. The portrait of the national character has in it shades of more than common depth.

"The Japanese are endowed with many qualities which, under wiser rule, would render them worthy of esteem. They possess a certain nobility of character (if we may so call it), which not even their great moral corruption has been able altogether to destroy. They possess quickness, shrewdness, and tact, above all other Asiatics. They are intellectual in an eminent degree; all can read, and are fond of reading. Even the agricultural labourer will snatch a few minutes from his work to indulge in the perusal of some favourite book. In manners (as we have already observed) they have nothing to acquire from Europeans. The bearing of the humblest peasant is marked by a natural courtesy; while that of the middle and higher classes is distinguished by a studied dignity and refinement. To these natural and acquired graces of character there is, however, one serious drawback. A more licentious people does not exist. The very toys of the children are designed to inoculate the infant mind with vice; shame is unknown, and indecency of language and conduct is all but universal. Government and religion equally countenance and sanction vice. Deception is universal, and all classes laugh immoderately when detected in a lie. They have no real religion, nor do they affect any. All contemplate death with indifference and speak of it with levity. The higher classes are keen, sceptical, and sarcastic, believing nothing, hoping nothing, dreading nothing. Their only religious rights are scenes of festive mirth, combined with abominable immorality. It is astonishing that a thousand years of such misgovernment as would have utterly barbarised any other people should have left so much that is humane, polished, and amiable in their character."—P. 478.

The account which follows of the Anti-Papal Movement in Italy encourages the hope that a day of religious, as well as of civil, liberty is about to dawn on that classic land. The Papal authorities seem to have no perception of the way to meet the present crisis. The education of the clergy, instead of improving, is becoming worse. They are denied access to the universities, and are kept within ecclesiastical seminaries, where no general intellectual culture is given, but where a dreary ecclesiastical fanaticism is instilled. The candidates for the priesthood have to pass an examination, the text-books of which are certain ultra-montane journals, which the reviewer describes as bearing to the Catholic Church the same relation that the *Record* and the *Witness* bear to the Church of England. In alluding to the outbreaks of anti-papal feeling, the reviewer speaks of some alarming symptoms, such as the denial of all notion of a ministry, and the hesitating to pray to the Holy Ghost, and, he adds, "the merest antinomianism." Some of the more enthusiastic English sects are setting proselytizing agency at work in Italy, but with as little real knowledge of the people whom they would evangelize as of the gospel they profess to teach. The representation of the interests of the Church of England in Italy is far from satisfactory. In one of the great cities a silly chaplain mixed himself up with a revival, one feature of which was especially abhorrent to a true Churchman, "all sorts of sects took part;" the hero of the revival was an evangelical footman. To one opinion expressed by the reviewer, our own information respecting the state of opinion and feeling in free Italy gives confirmation, viz., that a bare and naked Protestantism is not likely to impress or find favour with an imaginative and (in art at least) cultivated race like the Italians.—Next comes an article on Mr. Froude's volumes (*not yet published*) on the History of England in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. The book will doubtless far surpass in interest the review. Cecil is of course the hero of the history; Leicester is

described as the Queen's evil genius; and the hapless and too guilty Queen of Scots is described in the light of history rather than of poetical fancy.—An article follows with the not unattractive title of the Church of England and her Bishops. The episcopal trio who sit for their portraiture are Blomfield, Stanley and Daniel Wilson, who may not unfitly represent the three sections of High, Broad and Low Church. To no one of the three men does the reviewer award the highest place of merit and service to the Church. He characterizes the Bishop of Calcutta as shallow and technical in his theology, egotistically self-important, and strongly influenced in his episcopal administration by party spirit. The Life of Daniel Wilson, by a clerical son-in-law, is one of the feeblest and dullest books of biography, filling two large octavo volumes, to be succeeded by a collection of his letters, which, if we may judge from those hitherto made public, will sorely task the patience of readers out of the *evangelical* pale, within which the Bishop supposed religion exclusively to dwell. It is pleasant and somewhat amusing to read a High-churchman's censure of the narrowness of the other school:

"To guide the quickening mind of India, he had but the maxims of a party; and to form that mighty archiepiscopate but the traditions of an expiring sect. That this narrowness of mind interfered materially with the success of his episcopate, we cannot for a moment doubt. Surely upon the wide field of India, there was room for employing, with the heartiest support, men of the greatest powers and the most earnest Christianity, even though they did not adopt the exact phraseology of Islington. Yet the Bishop's conduct to Professor Street proved that no such breadth of view ever animated his mind. Signs of this intense narrowness are continually making themselves manifest. 'Caird's Sermon preached before the Queen' had 'no light of Christ shining in the discourse' (p. 499). Prescott's writings delight him, and he adds, 'I wish he was a Christian man' (p. 501). 'Milman's sixth volume will do immense good as against Popery; but he sadly fails in spiritual and evangelical views, as all the ecclesiastical historians do, except Milner' (p. 502).

"This was not the temper to convert India, or to leave on the records of the future the glorious title which might have been won of 'the English Xavier.'"—P. 550.

We shall see presently how the reviewer falls into narrowness and bigotry not very unlike that he censures in Daniel Wilson. The reviewer is far from enthusiastic when he comes to the late Bishop of London. He takes exception to the apology which his son had constructed in his biography for his father's share in the Ecclesiastical Commission. What has made that Commission odious is the spirit of episcopal favouritism and jobbery which has characterized it. Mr. Blomfield urges that these things were done after his father had ceased to work the Commission. The reviewer shews that this is not the case. Bishop Blomfield is responsible for £14,621. 15s. 6d. spent on the palace of his brother of Ripon; for £52,194. 13s. 3d. spent on the palace and grounds of his brother of Lincoln; for £23,627. 5s. spent on the palace connected with the Bishopric of Gloucester and Bristol;* for £4800 spent on the palace and chapel of his holy brother of Oxford; for £7000 for *alterations* merely in the (once) royal palace of Hartlebury, where the Bishop

* It is a significant fact that the palace at Stapleton was shortly after thought unsuitable and sold, fetching £12,000, a little more than one-half the sum which Bishop Blomfield and his co-trustees had paid. If there were not jobbery in this case, there was a gross inaptitude for business.

of Worcester dwelleth; for £7125 for a palace at Llandaff; and for £20,000 for Maudreth Hall, the humble dwelling where Bishop Lee writes learnedly on natural history and charitably to his brother of Natal. These items make a heavy amount: £129,368. 13s. 9d. for the personal comfort of only seven successors of the apostles. The reviewer offers some suggestions in abatement of the popular indignation which these figures arouse, but he puts himself out of court when he admits, as he does (p. 559), that there is "no need of a magnificent or a sumptuous dwelling for a Bishop."

Bishop Blomfield, though not blamed by the Quarterly reviewer for sanctioning this episcopal and palatial extravagance, is censured for want of foresight and courage in the matter of the revival of Convocation which he resisted. But the end is not yet, and perchance a little further experience of the doings and spirit of the revived Convocation may prove that Bishop Blomfield was not wrong in anticipating from this measure only danger to the Church. In handling the life of Dr. Stanley, formerly Bishop of Norwich, the reviewer has the gratification of shooting right and left, and of bringing down, with double-barrelled bigotry, an old bird and a young one. Bishop Stanley's Life was briefly but admirably written by his more gifted son. We reviewed the book in C.R., Vol. VII. The charge against the younger Stanley is "an inclination to blot out the supernatural element from revelation." The reviewer would, we believe, find it a difficult task to justify this charge. It is, as far as the Life of the Bishop of Norwich is concerned, a gratuitous piece of bigotry. To blacken the Bishop, we are reminded that he strove to make his episcopate the occasion of extending liberal sentiments in his profession; that in his first sermon in the cathedral he justified Dissent, "even rising to the height of Socinianism," from the guilt of schism. But a higher crime against the Church followed.

"This was bad enough; but the offence reached its height when his clergy met at their Bishop's table the leading preacher of the city, who denied the Godhead of our Lord. This storm was scarcely abated before the second was stirred up by the appearance of his name, unintentionally, his biographer says, on his part so far as its being made public goes, as subscribing for the publication of a volume of sermons by 'an old Unitarian minister at Newcastle-upon-Tyne.'"—P. 570.

If anything could make bigotry see its own littleness and deformity, the proceedings by which Bishops Stanley and Maltby were annoyed at the time to which the reviewer refers, simply for a goodnatured act done in a spirit of large Christian charity, were calculated to produce this effect. It is strange and humiliating that, after a period of twenty or thirty years, the fanatical "outbreak that followed" should be referred to with praise, and by a writer who thinks narrowness of sentiment not creditable to an Anglican Bishop. Other offences of Bishop Stanley indicated by the reviewer, were his sermon before the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, in which he disowned belief in the Church figment of "Apostolical Succession," and his supporting in the House of Lords a petition for altering the terms of clerical subscription. This portion of the article is evidently dictated by a spirit of panic. While professedly writing about events which date a generation back, our Churchman has his eye on the Colensos and Jowetts and Temples, and other outspoken men, who do not always frame their thoughts and words

after the model of the Creeds of Nice and Athanasius. The passage that follows is, if put from the past into the present tense, the sort of statement which terrified rectors and excited curates have been wont of late to address to their Ordinary :

“Every influence of the world of letters, of the world of business, and of the world of politics, threatened to make it unbelieving. The scoffer and the sceptic already paraded their presence, their doubts, and their gibes in our very streets; and the whole flow of thought was, in religious matters, towards independence, self-assertion, and lawlessness. At such a time a thoroughly prescient spirit would, above all things, have feared doing or saying anything which could set against each other schools which, though they differed in many things, represented in common a master belief in a fixed and definite Revelation. If those who were risking all for Catholic faith and observance; if those who held as their one spiritual inheritance a belief that the apprehension of the doctrine of the Atonement and of the Spirit’s influences lay at the root of all individual life in God; if, lastly, those who received passively, but held firmly, the old Anglican teaching, leaning neither to the individualism of the last, nor to the objective yearnings of the first class; if these three could have been brought to act really together, where might not now the Church of England be?”—Pp. 572, 573.

Why I was an Atheist, and why I am now a Christian: a Statement delivered at Taylor’s Repository, Newington Road, London, on Tuesday, Aug. 18, 1863. By J. B. Bebbington (late Editor of the Propagandist). H. J. Tresidder.

It is not very clear why Mr. Bebbington should ever have become (or imagined himself) an atheist, unless every young man of intelligence who is brought up among ignorant orthodox people is to seek help in Paine, Volney and D’Holbach, instead of reading Creation, Science and the Scriptures for himself. Nor is his return to Christianity very reasonably accounted for. A thoroughly unsuccessful tour of atheistical lecturing in Scotland seems to have put him out of conceit with himself, and to have been the turning-point of his mental history; but he gives no clear account of the process of his re-conversion, and it would seem that he is come back into a very commonplace and muddled orthodoxy, such as may easily provoke others into his course over again. “*God has revealed himself*” to Mr. B., and he now understands that “the sacrifice of Christ is a righteous reason for God’s mercy. Given a moral Governor and guilty man, the whole scheme of the Christian atonement flows easily, logically, necessarily.” The more advanced of men called orthodox do not speak thus disparagingly of the Heavenly Father. If atheism is cured in Mr. B.’s case, he will, we fear, supply its suggestion to others like his former self.

His classification of unbelievers is probably correct; it will be seen that it includes his own case as estimated by himself.

“The causes of unbelief are legion. Some unbelievers are such—and I say this in despite of the disclaimers that may be made—only out of a desire to rid themselves of an irksome restraint; these are not to be found either attending lectures or joining societies. Others, of cold nature, investigate the problem of the existence of God, expecting to find mathematical demonstration of His existence; these lose themselves in the tortuous path of a crabbed and mistaken logic. There is another class—to this I belonged. A young man, of sixteen or seventeen years of age, finds his intellectual powers just beginning to unfold themselves, a new world opening itself to his enamoured gaze.

He disdains the hollow frivolities of the world, and devours in secret the lore which is stored up in books. Stolen waters are sweet, and every book against which an anathema has been launched has an especial charm for him. It may be pride of intellect or love of singularity, it may be the sophistry of the Humes or the rhetoric of the D'Holbachs, which leads him astray. But in the immaturity of his judgment—blessed only with that 'little philosophy' which, Bacon says, 'inclineth men's minds to atheism'—he yields himself captive. And having thus early made up his mind, he rests satisfied. Whatever he may afterwards study, what page of history he may explore, what science he may master, he never reviews his early formed conclusions. Happy for him if, in after years, some event causes him again to inquire; when his judgment has attained something like maturity, to subject to a searching examination the grounds of his disbelief. If there be one here whose case this is, I would, with all the earnestness of which I am capable, adjure him again to sit down to the work of calm, anxious—were it bootless to say, prayerful?—inquiry. Probably my experience will be his. Probably he will discover how crude and baseless are those notions on which he so fondly leans, never dreaming of their rottenness. Probably he will find that 'depth in philosophy'—to complete Lord Bacon's sentence—'bringeth men's minds about to religion.'"

Mr. Bebbington seems never to have been happy in his atheism; and he gives an edifying account of the mental despotism exercised by the high-priests of the so-called *Free-thinking*.

OBITUARY.

Sept. 28, suddenly, at Constantinople, in the 26th year of his age, THOMAS, second son of the late Charles BOOTH, Esq., of Liverpool.

Oct. 11, in her 6th year, BERTHA WILSON, youngest child of William and Jane TITFORD, Highbury New Park.

Oct. 12, at Mount Trafford, Eccles, Lancashire, ANNA MARIA, wife of John Russell BEARD, Esq.

Oct. 12, at Vienna, OLIVER PAGET, Esq.,

of Szokefolva, Transylvania, son-in-law of Charles Paget, Esq., M.P.

Oct. 17, at Legh Place, Ardwick, aged 49 years, MARY ELLEN, relict of Samuel ASHWORTH, Esq.

Oct. 20, at Cliff House, Berstall, Leicestershire, ANNE ISABELLA, widow of Henry LAKIN, Esq., late of Hanley Castle, Worcestershire, aged 78.

Oct. 22, HARRIET, wife of Jos. CHAMBERLAIN, of Harborne Road, Edgbaston, aged 27 years.

MARRIAGES.

Sept. 29, at Holywood, Belfast, by Rev. C. J. M'Alister, J. CARTER HOLLINS, of Snitterfield, Warwickshire, to ANNIE MONTGOMERY, eldest daughter of John R. NEILL, of Belfast.

Oct. 7, at the Unitarian chapel, Northampton, by Rev. Iden Payne, CHARLES, youngest son of Charles JACKS, Esq., of Thorpe, near Norwich, to HANNAH, only daughter of Samuel HORSEY, Esq., of Northampton.

Oct. 13, in the Remonstrant Meeting-house, Warren Point, by Rev. Hugh Moore, of Newtown-ards, Rev. SAMUEL MOORE to

ANNIE, youngest daughter of the late Rev. James LUNN, Beech Cottage, Warren Point, minister of Carlingford.

Oct. 15, at Hope-Street church, Liverpool, by Rev. C. C. Coe, EDGAR FRANKLIN COOPER, Esq., of Leicester, to MARY JANE, only daughter of H. D. THEW, Esq., of Laurel Bank, Wavertree.

Oct. 20, at St. Pancras New Church, by Rev. Canon Champneys, vicar, WILLIAM SANDERSON WYMAN, M.D., Hatfield, Broad Oak, Essex, to HENRIETTA, youngest daughter of John Sutton NETTLEFOLD, Esq., the Grove, Highgate.